

P  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

JUN 16 1959

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

# modern language notes

VOL. LXXIV, NO. 5, MAY 1959

- 385 Chaucer's Rosary and Donne's Bracelet: Ambiguous Coral.  
FRANCIS MANLEY
- 389 Ben Jonson and an Unknown Poet on the King's Senses.  
C. F. MAIN
- 393 Donne on the Mandrake. D. C. ALLEN
- 397 *Queen Mab*: The Inconsistency of Ahasuerus.  
WILLIAM H. MARSHALL
- 400 Tennyson's "The Epic": A Gesture of Recovered Faith.  
J. S. LAWRY
- 404 Hawthorne: Mr. Hooper's "Affable Weakness."  
THOMAS F. WALSH
- 407 *Typee* and Milton: Paradise Well Lost. ROBERT STANTON
- 412 The Alleged Sources of Girart D'Amiens's *Charlemagne*.  
GERARD J. BRAULT
- 416 *Inferno*, I, 106-108. RICHARD M. HAYWOOD
- 418 On *La Entretienida* of Cervantes. JUAN BAUTISTA AVALLE-ARCE
- 422 Artifice and Sincerity in the Poetry of Tristan l'Hermite.  
PHILIP A. WADSWORTH
- 430 Pastor Bertrand and Voltaire's *Lisbonne*. FRANCIS J. CROWLEY
- 433 A New Date for *Jacques le fataliste*. JACK UNDANK
- 438 *Hildebrandslied* 21a. W. P. LEHMANN
- 440 A New Solution to the "Nacht. Offen Feld" Scene of Goethe's  
*Faust*. DOUGLAS F. BUB

## REVIEWS

- 444 EDWARD I. SELIG, *The Flourishing Wreath: A Study of Thomas Carew's Poetry* (R. A. DURR)
- 447 ARTHUR SHERBO, *English Sentimental Drama* (JOHN LOFTIS)
- 451 ALBERT GÉRARD, *L'Idée romantique de la poésie en Angleterre: Etudes sur la théorie de la poésie chez Coleridge, Wordsworth, Keats et Shelley*; JACQUES VOISINE, J.-J. Rousseau en Angleterre à l'époque romantique. *Les Ecrits autobiographiques et la légende*; BICE CHIAPPELLI, *Il Pensiero Religioso di Shelley*; MICHELE RENZULLI, John Keats: *L'Uomo e Il Poeta* (CARLOS BAKER)
- 453 LORD BYRON, "Don Juan": *A Variorum Edition IV Vols.*, ed. TRUMAN GUY STEFFAN and WILLIS W. PRATT (LESLIE A. MARCHAND)
- 455 GORDON N. RAY, *Thackeray: The Age of Wisdom, 1847-1863* (E. D. H. JOHNSON)
- 458 JOHN RUSKIN, *Diaries: Vol. II: 1848-1873*, selected and ed. by JOAN EVANS and JOHN HOWARD WHITEHOUSE (JOHN TYREE FAIN)
- 460 JOSEPH ANTHONY MAZZEO, *Structure and Thought in the Paradiso* (JOHN FRECCERO)
- 465 JOHN N. PAPPAS, *Bethier's Journal de Trévoux and the Philosophes* (ROBERT E. TAYLOR)
- 466 THEODORE BESTERMAN, ed., *Les Lettres de la Marquise du Châtelet* (NORMAN L. TORREY)
- 468 CHARLES BAUDELAIRE, *The Centennial Celebration of Baudelaire's "Les Fleurs du Mal"* (J. D. HUBERT)
- 470 C. F. MACINTYRE, trans., *French Symbolist Poetry* (ROBERT CHAMPIGNY)
- 471 WOLFGANG LANGE, *Studien zur christlichen Dichtung der Nordgermanen, 1000-1200* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 473 JOST HERMAND, *Die literarische Formenwelt des Biedermeiers* (HEINRICH MEYER)
- 477 GERHARD LOOSE, *Ernst Jünger. Gestalt und Werk* (BERNHARD BLUME)
- 479 *Konunga sögur I-III*. Ed. by GUDNI JÓNSSON (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 479 GÖSTA HOLM, *Syntaxgeografiska Studier över två Nordiska Verb* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)

## modern language notes

NATHAN EDELMAN,  
*General Editor*

WOLFGANG E. THORMANN,  
*Managing Assistant*

DON CAMERON ALLEN  
CHARLES R. ANDERSON  
STEFÁN EINARSSON  
RENÉ N. GIRARD  
RICHARD H. GREEN  
THOMAS R. HART, JR.  
ANNA G. HATCHER  
HAROLD JANTZ  
WILLIAM H. MCCLAIN  
J. HILLIS MILLER  
LAWRENCE J. ROSS  
CHARLES S. SINGLETON  
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$6.00 in the United States; \$6.25 in Canada; \$6.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md. Claims for replacement of missing numbers must be received within 3 months (6 months in the case of foreign subscribers) following publication of the number.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md. Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress, 16 July 1894.

y

théorie  
E, J.-J.  
s et la  
John

TEFFAN

JOHN

CERO)  
AYLOR)  
ORREY)  
ITS du

0-1200

a)

SON)

H  
d  
o  
t  
H

through  
s; \$6.25  
c, \$1.00.  
s should  
18, Md.  
must be  
of for  
number.

T  
l

manuscript  
es, The  
Every  
t return  
ors are

e, Md.  
rate of  
ongres,

v

théorie  
J.-J.  
et la  
John

EFFAN

JOHN

ERO)  
YLON)  
RREY)  
TS du

0-1200

ON)

through  
; \$6.25  
\$, \$1.00  
should  
8, Md.  
must be  
of for-  
number.  
scriptions  
es, The  
Every  
return  
ors are

e, Md.  
rate of  
ngren,

# modern language notes

VOL. LXXIV, NO. 5, MAY 1959

## Chaucer's Rosary and Donne's Bracelet: Ambiguous Coral

When the tidal wave of the Renaissance ebbed and removed the beach and the world with it, there were left among other fragments deposited in our literature two particularly well-wrought pieces of coral, which unfortunately had their meaning broken off. One of them is a rosary carried by Chaucer's delicate prioress, the Lady Eglentyne:

Of smal coral aboute hire arm she bar  
A peire of bedes, gauded al with grene,  
And theron heng a brooch of gold ful sheene,  
On which ther was first write a crowned A,  
And after *Amor vincit omnia*.

(*Prologue*, 158-162)

The other is a bracelet, presumably (in the context of the poem) a love token, declined by John Donne:

No, nor the Coralls which thy wrist infold,  
Lac'd up together in congruity,  
To shew our thoughts should rest in the same hold.

(*Sonnet. The Token*, 10-12)

Together, both of these apparently dissimilar ornaments form a unit of sorts, like the opposite sides of the same coin. Each is a reversed reflection of the same set of traditional beliefs, and consequently each illuminates the other. But before the image comes clear it must be viewed from a perspective deeper in time than Imperial Rome.

In Roman folklore coral was from Saturnian times a recognized and effective amulet against the evil eye, which everyone knew could distract and ultimately turn the mind unless something were done about it. So hunting dogs were furnished with collars made from Maltese coral and other ingredients to keep them from running rabid ("ac sic effectus oculique venena maligni / vicit tutela pax impetrata deorum");<sup>1</sup> babies were weighted with branches of coral,<sup>2</sup> and whenever adults felt the bad effects of fascination, they undoubtedly used it themselves since Pliny implies that it was one of the standard remedies.<sup>3</sup> Even Indians wore it "amoliendis periculis."<sup>4</sup> But of course early Christians like Isidore of Seville scorned such superstition.<sup>5</sup> It persisted, nevertheless, and in the process underwent a number of changes. First of all, the evil eye became transformed into the manifold fascinations of the devil, and almost every Medieval lapidary after the twelfth century assured the faithful that coral had the power to protect their minds from the malice and snares of the common enemy: "a casu peccati p̄seruat: ipsa diabolica mōstra.

<sup>1</sup> Grattius, *Cynegeticon quae supersunt*, ed. P. J. Euk (Zutphaniae, 1897), p. 64, ll. 406-407. The verses read in full:

quid, priscas artes inventaque simplicis aevi,  
si referam? non illa metus solacia falsi  
tam longam traxere fidem. collaribus ergo  
sunt qui lucifugae cristas inducere maelis  
iussere aut sacris conserta monilia conchis  
et vivom lapidem et circa Melitensia nectunt  
curalia et magicis adiutas cantibus herbas.

(399-405)

<sup>2</sup> Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*, xxxii, 2, 11: "Surculi infantiae adalligati, tutelam habere creduntur." In the Renaissance these were still used for teething purposes (Sir Thomas Browne, *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, v, 23, 5), and some, like the one owned by the infant Mr. Spectator, were deluxe models with bells on them (*The Spectator*, No. 1).

<sup>3</sup> "Gorgonia nihil aliud est quam curalium; . . . hanc fascinationibus resistere adfirmant" (xxxvii, 10, 59). This was the reading until the establishment of an accurate text in the late nineteenth century, but now it is relegated to a variant, and the preferred reading is ". . . Fulminibus et typhoni resistere adfirmant." Both versions were known in the Medieval period, however, and both had equal authority.

<sup>4</sup> Pliny, xxxii, 2, 11.

<sup>5</sup> After quoting Pliny's account of coral Isidore adds a supercilious "si creditur" (PL 82, 573). Rabanus Maurus helped publicize this sneer by copying Isidore in full (PL 111, 471).

i. diabolicas illusiones, sive deceptiones fugat.”<sup>6</sup> Eventually this protection became so powerful that it took in whole houses, but even then coral was believed especially consecrated by God to safeguard holy places: “In domo autem positus conservat eam ab omni maleficio. . . . Consecratur vero a Deo ut sanctis locis hoc tutamentum (ut) sit maximum, die ac nocte, hora diurna atque nocturna, bonumque praesidium.”<sup>7</sup> The second important change this tradition underwent conflicted with the first by contradicting it and so created a peculiar ambiguity, which Chaucer and Donne availed themselves of. For at the same time coral kept sin out of one door, it let it in at another: “whoso bereþ þis stone vpone him or one his fynger, he schal get loue.”<sup>8</sup> Naturally not everyone wanted that kind of love, and far in the Renaissance voices are heard decrying the decline in the production of coral rosaries: “Daemonos infensos arcere perhibetur. Vt & huic suspicandum sit prudentem vetustatem, corallio p̄ diversas formas (non sine licet fastu quodam aut illecebra nunc vsurpetur) effigiato & ex ordine infilato, preces Marianas docuisse numerare.”<sup>9</sup> But probably the clearest expression of the ambiguity produced by these stratified traditions occurs near the end of the tradition itself, in Ulysses Aldrovandus’ monumental *Musaeum Metallicum*:

<sup>6</sup> Frater Joanne a S. Geminiano, *Summa de Exemplis et Rerum Similitudinibus Locupletissima* (Venetiis, 1584). This was first written in the second half of the fourteenth century. For further remarks concerning the ability of coral to combat the power of Satan see Marbode, *PL* 171, 1753; Vincent de Beauvais, VIII, 56-57; *Anglo-Norman Lapidaries*, ed. Paul Studer and Joan Evans (Paris, 1924), pp. 48, 103, 130, 146, 223-224, 286; *English Mediaeval Lapidaries*, ed. Joan Evans and Mary S. Serjeantson, *EETS* 190 (London, 1933), pp. 53, 77-78; *Poème Moralisé sur les Propriétés des Choses*, ed. Gaston Raynaud, *Romania*, xiv (1885), 457; Andreas Bacchius, *De Gemmis et Lapidibus*, trans. Wolfgang Gabelchover (Francofurti, 1603), p. 208; and Anselmus Boethius de Boot, *Gemmarum et Lapidum Historia*, ed. Adrianus Toll (Lugduni Batavorum, 1636), pp. 309, 315.

<sup>7</sup> The lapidary of Damigeron, cited in *Anglo-Norman Lapidaries*, ed. Studer and Evans, p. 364.

<sup>8</sup> *English Mediaeval Lapidaries*, ed. Evans and Serjeantson, p. 77. This reference from the fifteenth-century Peterborough Lapidary is the earliest one I have found, but I believe the tradition is considerably older than that. Ulysses Aldrovandus (see below note 10) seems to imply that it was classical in origin. If so, it may ultimately go back to Pliny’s citation of Iuba concerning *crinis Isidis* and *chariton blepharon*, better known in the Renaissance as black coral or *Gorgonia Antipathes*: “Iuba tradit circa Trogodytarum insulas fruticem in alto vocari Isidis crinem, curalio similem sine foliis, praecisum mutato colore in nigrum durescere, cum cadit frangi; item alium qui vocetur chariton blepharon, efficacem in amatoriiis; spatia eo facere et mollia feminas” (XIII, 25, 52).

<sup>9</sup> Franciscus Rueus, *De Gemmis Aliquot* (Tiguri, 1566), fol. 56v-57r.

Priscorum Matronae, & Puellae Coralia ad conciliandam gratiam gestabant, quia talem virtutē illi inesse opinabantur, quamobrem qui res terrestres suis planetis assignant, veluti Soli Styracem, & Mastichen sacrarunt, ita Veneri tanquam Deae venustatis, & gratiae Corallium tanquam dicatum obtulerunt. Talis gestandorum Coraliorum consuetudo ad nostra vsque tempora penetrauit, dum monilia, & coronae precariae ex Coralijs parantur, & aduersus prauas affectiones gestantur.<sup>10</sup>

My point by now should be obvious enough. Chaucer gave his graceful lady prioress a string of beads as delicately ambiguous as everything else about her. Superficially, of course, a bride of Christ should want to protect herself from the ravishment of the world, and, as we have seen, a coral rosary would offer her double indemnity: the stones as well as the prayers would save her from temptation. But any such surface statement is qualified by the ambiguous *Amor* with which the beads are tagged. For if coral was a well-known charm for earthly love, then perhaps the lady's inclination is not quite so heavenly as we had thought, and perhaps that explains why her beads are small and fine enough to please the gross eyes of the world.<sup>11</sup> Donne, on the other hand, utilized the same ambiguity, but he inverted it. Instead of a rosary he has what seems to be, on the surface at least, a love charm. Yet coral love charms were supposed to lure or entice, not protect, and this one would not only bind his thoughts to his lady's, but would also repose their thoughts inside the charmed circle of the coral (reading both meanings of "rest in the same hold"). In other words, if Donne accepted this bracelet so as to allow his thoughts to rest in the same coral hold as his lady's, then his mind would be as circumscribed and free of *prauas affectiones* as hers. Since that is precisely what he wants to avoid, he naturally rejects the idea, but he does it with a seductive duplicity, just as at the end of the poem, after telling her not to send him this or that love trinket to increase his store (as though he had a warehouse full), he asks only that she believe he loves her, which is not quite the same as saying that he does or even that he may.

The Johns Hopkins University

FRANCIS MANLEY

<sup>10</sup> (Bononiae, 1648), p. 297. The Lapidario of Alfonso X also notes that coral is under the sway of Venus (see George F. Kunz, *The Curious Lore of Precious Stones* [New York, 1913], p. 348).

<sup>11</sup> Appropriately enough, the other worldly religious in the *Prologue*, the monk, "hadde of gold ywrought a ful curious pyn; / A love-knotte in the gretter ende ther was" (196-197).

## Ben Jonson and an Unknown Poet on the King's Senses

Some time ago Professor Allan Gilbert discussed in these pages<sup>1</sup> the resemblances between a virulently satirical poem on James I—that has found its way, oddly enough, into the collected poems of William Drummond—and a song sung by the Patrico in Jonson's masque, *The Gypsies Metamorphosed* (lines 1327-1385). Both the poem and the song are in the form of a litany requesting the Lord to protect the king's senses from certain things; both devote a stanza to each of the five senses, and both have similar refrains. The likenesses between the two pieces are as unmistakable as the differences: Jonson's song, which is flattering in intention, asks that the king be protected from certain of his pet phobias, like tobacco, strident ladies, and unhealthy hunting dogs; the poem, which is satirical in intention, asks that the king be protected against his well-known excesses, such as his overfondness for beardless youths, his overindulgence in hunting, and his overfriendliness with Spain. Disguised as a prayer, the poem is actually an outspoken list of James's vices compiled by a censorious person familiar with court gossip. It is what was commonly known in the Renaissance as a "libel." Which came first, the libel or the song? Professor Gilbert suggested that Jonson based the song on the libel, a copy of which Drummond might have had in 1619, and he closed his speculations with the question, "Is the Patrico's song a reminiscence of Jonson's visit to Hawthornden?" The evidence suggests a negative answer: the libel is best regarded as a pendant to the song. Moreover, the question would not have arisen had the poem itself, as well as the attribution to Drummond, been examined more carefully.

Although copies of the libel appear in early seventeenth-century commonplace books and manuscript miscellanies, none that I have seen is assigned to Drummond.<sup>2</sup> Every copy is anonymous except that in Folger MS. 425. 5, which gives it to James Johnson, a person whom I am unable to identify, unless he is the author of *Schediasmata*

<sup>1</sup> "Jonson and Drummond or Gil on the King's Senses," *MLN*, LXII (1947), 35-37.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Harvard MS, Eng. 686; Folger MSS. 1669.2, 1027.2, 2017.7; St. John's College, Cambridge, MS. 432; and David Mathew, *The Jacobean Age* (London, 1938), p. 19. The Cambridge MS. also contains a hitherto unnoticed copy of Jonson's song in which Buckingham is substituted for James.

*poetica* (1614) and *Epigrammatum libellus* (1615), an identification that seems unlikely. Drummond's authorship lacks any contemporary support; his claim goes back no further than 1711, when Bishop John Sage and Thomas Ruddiman printed the poem for the first time in *A Collection of All the Poems Written by William Drummond of Hawthornden*. The original of Sage and Ruddiman's text has been lost, but presumably it came from one of the manuscripts put at their disposal by the poet's son, Sir William. It seems most unlikely, however, that this lost original was the author's copy, for the 1711 text is extremely corrupt: lines five and six of the stanza entitled "Tasting," for example, make little sense, and in the final stanza the word *seeing*—the other texts read *viewing*—is rhymed with *undoing*. A comparison of the 1711 text with, say, that printed in the Hazlitt-Huth *Inedited Poetical Miscellanies* (1870) shows that the former is faulty in many other respects. Unless we assume that Sage and Ruddiman were monumentally careless editors, we must conclude that they did not have access to a reliable text but to one that had undergone considerable deterioration from repeated transcription. That Drummond may have once owned a copy of a popular libel is not surprising, for he was an indefatigable collector of other men's verses.<sup>3</sup>

The force of tradition in such matters is so strong that the libel has remained among Drummond's works up to the present, though L. E. Kastner placed it among "Poems of Doubtful Authenticity."<sup>4</sup> Kastner printed an anonymous copy from a manuscript in the hand of Sir James Balfour. The Scottish forms in this copy led Professor Gilbert to conclude that "the normal, though perhaps not the neces-

<sup>3</sup> The unanswerable, and I think irrelevant, question of whether Drummond had the sort of temperament to write a severe satire on King James has received some attention. By citing an implied comparison between James and Nero that Drummond made in a personal letter, Professor Gilbert cast doubt on W. C. Ward's opinion (*The Poems of William Drummond* [London, "Muses' Library," n.d.], II, 328) that the satire is too "severe" to be Drummond's. To support Ward's view, one might cite a letter to Drayton (B. H. Newdigate, *Michael Drayton and his Circle* [Oxford, 1941], p. 183) in which Drummond expressed his distaste for "envenomed Satyres and spitefull jeasts." Citing and counter-citing of this sort could go on indefinitely. Recently French Rowe Fogle has suggested (*A Critical Study of William Drummond of Hawthornden* [New York, 1952], p. 149) that the "satiric note" in Drummond's *Entertainment* written for the reception of Charles I into Edinburgh "makes one wonder whether Drummond might not have written the verse satire, *The Five Senses*." The "satiric notes" in the two pieces seem vastly different to me; moreover, the libel is at least ten years older than the *Entertainment* and was designed for a different monarch.

<sup>4</sup> *The Poetical Works of William Drummond of Hawthornden* (Edinburgh, 1913), II, 296-299.

sary, assumption is that the manuscript version is the original one and that it was written by a Scotchman." Perhaps the author was a Scot, but certainly his text is not the one printed by Kastner, which is every bit as corrupt as the 1711 text. Balfour's stanzas are not even in the proper order.<sup>5</sup> Until evidence to the contrary turns up, we must conclude that the author of the libel was an Englishman and that copies in both Scottish and English were circulating in Scotland.

Was Jonson familiar with this anonymous libel, and did he parody it in a masque performed three times before the delighted James in 1621? Several considerations suggest that he did not use the libel in this way and that he did not even know it. First, at the time when the masque was being produced, there were rumors that Jonson was about to be elevated to the knighthood or to the office of Master of the Revels.<sup>6</sup> Under these circumstances it would seem unlikely that he would risk offending the king by calling attention to a notorious lampoon that blatantly accused him of a homosexual relationship with his favorite. Jonson was never without ill-wishers who would have been eager to inform Buckingham, if not the king, of his indiscretion. The libel, incidentally, is very insulting to Buckingham, one of the principal performers in the masque. In short, the supposition that Jonson imitated the libel imputes to him a recklessness and a cynicism that are quite out of keeping with his character at this stage of his life. A second consideration is the nature of the court masque, an art form that demanded novelty and that was intolerant of warmed-over matter. Hence, even had the libel been respectable as raw material, Jonson would not, probably, have imitated it. Finally, and most important, literary currents in the early seventeenth century are more likely to run downhill than up: the writer of plays for the public stage imitated the devices used in the court masque; the composer of broadside ballads diluted and dilated the aristocratic lyric; the anonymous libeler perverted an innocent piece of writing already in circulation. Metrical—one hesitates to call them poetical—libels are a branch of popular literature not yet much investigated, but a case analogous to the present one might be cited. Thomas Bastard's *Chrestoleros* (1598, sig. H6) contains a satirical epigram beginning "Gæta from wooll and weauing first beganne / Swelling and swelling

<sup>5</sup> Balfour's text has this order: seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, feeling. All the other copies of the poem, as well as Jonson's song, have this order: seeing, hearing, tasting, feeling, smelling—the most common arrangement of the "senses" in Renaissance literature.

<sup>6</sup> *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson (Oxford, 1925), I, 87.

to a gentleman" and going on to describe the subsequent career of Gaeta, who finally "swole to be a lord: and then he burst." There is extant in Harvard MS. Eng. 686 (p. 26) a rhymed libel on Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset, beginning "When Carr in court at first a page beganne" and continuing in the same vein as Bastard's satire. No one would hesitate to give priority to Bastard.

Two other interrelated matters remain to be clarified: the date of the libel and its connection with Alexander Gill, the son of Milton's schoolmaster. Commentators on the libel have overlooked both the internal and external evidence for the date. Kastner, for example, said that the satire "fits Charles I equally well, if not better" than it fits James,<sup>7</sup> and Professor Gilbert noted Kastner's suggestion without comment, though it renders his question about the possibility that Jonson heard the libel at Hawthornden completely meaningless. The content of the libel makes it obvious that the monarch in question is James, because Charles did not pursue a policy of friendship with Spain after he became king, nor was he ever charged with carrying on the sort of relationship with the favorite Buckingham that is implied in the libel. There is no reason not to accept the date "1623" borne by the copy in MS. Folger 452. 5. The libel, then, was somewhat out of date and had probably been copied hundreds of times before it caused trouble for Gill in 1628.

Gill was arrested on September 5, 1628, twelve days after the assassination of Buckingham, for making seditious speeches during a visit to Oxford and for possessing papers that libeled Charles and his ministers. At his examination, conducted by Laud and others, no mention of the libel on the king's senses seems to have been made, but since a fragmentary copy of the libel bearing the name "Gill" on its back has been preserved among the state papers, the assumption has been frequently made that one of the charges against Gill was the composition of the libel, a poetical feat that would probably have been beyond his powers.<sup>8</sup> Professor Donald Clark, for example, has remarked, "It seems improbable that Gil would accept the attribution of the poem to him when it was adduced as part of the evidence

<sup>7</sup> *Poetical Works of Drummond*, II, 415.

<sup>8</sup> *C. S. P. D. 1628-1629* (1859), pp. 319, 240, lists the documents. The assumption that Gill wrote the libel was made by W. D. Hamilton, *Original Papers Illustrative of the Life and Writings of John Milton* (Camden Society, 1854), p. 67; A. F. Leach, "Milton as Schoolboy and Schoolmaster," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, III (1908), 303; M. F. J. McDonnell, *A History of St. Paul's School* (London, 1909), pp. 183-184.

against him unless he was in fact the author. It seems likely that if he thought it by Drummond, or by Ben Jonson, say, he would have said so."<sup>9</sup> Gill indeed would have spoken up had he known of the connection between this libel and his enemy Jonson! But he probably knew no more about the authorship of the libel than we. He did know that he was in trouble, for the Star Chamber, despairing of uncovering authors, made it as heinous an offence to "publish" or circulate a libel as to write one.<sup>10</sup> An accident has connected Gill's name with fourteen lines of an anonymous satire on King James. But to say that Gill wrote these lines is to say that Sir Robert Cotton wrote the libel for which he was prosecuted merely because a copy was found in his library, or that Jonson wrote a poem praising the assassin Felton just because the attorney general questioned him about it.

To recapitulate. In 1621 Jonson composed a litany on King James's senses that was sung before the court in three productions of *The Gypsies Metamorphosed*. At some time between 1621 and 1625 an unidentified versifier—perhaps a certain James Johnson, but certainly neither Gill nor Drummond—turned the song into a libel on James that achieved a wide circulation in manuscript. The libel could have been sung to the same tune as the original song, and this circumstance must have promoted its circulation. Copies of the libel, somewhat corrupt textually, wandered to Scotland, where Drummond and Balfour seem to have known of it. It probably did not come to the attention of the authorities until 1628, when Gill perhaps possessed a fragment of it. Though these facts may seem to be few, we actually know more about the libel than did the contemporary authorities whose business it was to suppress such things.

Rutgers University

C. F. MAIN

## Donne on the Mandrake

In 1912 Grierson glossed "Get with child a mandrake root" with a not very helpful extract from *Vulgar Errors* on the man-shape of the root. This annotation was taken over, forty-four years later, by <sup>1956</sup>

<sup>9</sup> John Milton at St. Paul's School (New York, 1948), pp. 86-87.

<sup>10</sup> S. R. Gardiner, *Reports of Cases in the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission* (Camden Society, 1886), p. 151.

Redpath, who remarks that since not all mandrake roots resemble the male torso, one must avoid the "additional idea here of the impossibility of a male begetting a child on a male." It is, consequently, a good moment to consider what Donne meant by this line, and we are grandly informed by the four stanzas on the mandrake in "The Progresse of the Soule," stanzas elucidated in Grierson's edition by reprinting the passage from Sir Thomas Browne.

The migrant soul, Donne sets it down, flees from the apple when it is plucked by Satan and offered to Eve, and "in a Plant hous'd her anew." The plant forces its way through sparse soil, spreading east and west,

Grew on his middle parts, the first day, haire,  
To show, that in loves businesse hee should still  
A dealer bee, and be us'd well, or ill:  
His apples kindle, his leaves, force of conception kill.

A complete description of "this quiet mandrake" which repeats the botanical narratives of Pliny (25.13) and Dioscorides (4.78) succeeds, and then the herbal house of the wandering soul is destroyed by Eve.

No lustfull woman came this plant to grieve,  
But 'twas because there was none yet but Eve:  
And she (with other purpose) kill'd it quite;  
Her sinne had now brought in infirmities,  
And so her cradled child, the moist red eyes  
Had never shut, nor slept since it saw light;  
Poppie she knew, she knew the mandrakes might,  
And tore up both, and so coold her childs blood.

The whole history of the May apple is here.

The ancients had various notions about the mandragora; but when they reckoned up its uses to man, they valued it mainly as an aphrodisiac and a soporific. Dioscorides says that the plant is called *circaea* (because it was used by Circe to besot her guests) and that it is made into philtres, "φίλτρων . . . ποιητική" (IV. 75); Theophrastus states that it serves in the uses of Aphrodite: "λέγειν ὡς πλείστα περὶ ἀφροδισίων" (IX, 8, 8). For this reason Hesychius undoubtedly gives "Μανδραγορίτις" as an epithet for Aphrodite. This is, I think, the understanding that should be applied to "Get with child a mandrake root," but we must go still farther, and we are helped by the bestiaries.

According to Greek *Physiologus*, the elephant, cold by nature must

first eat of the mandrake when he wishes to beget young. To this end the elephant leads his mate to the neighborhood of Eden where this plant grows. First she eats; then he. The two elephants, the Greek text continues, are symbols of Adam and Eve who fell through eating the mandrake.<sup>1</sup> The Latin text is an expansive translation of the Greek:

Est animal qui dicitur elephans. In eo non est concupiscentiae coitus. . . . Si autem volverit filios facere, vadit in orientem prope paradysum; est autem ibi arbor que dicitur mandracora; et vadit ibi cum femina sua, que prior accipit de arbore, et tradit viro suo, et seducit eum, donec manducet. Et cum manducaverit masculus, statim femina in utero concipiet. . . .

Magnus ergo elephans et mulier eius personam accipiunt Ade et Eve. Cum autem essent in virtute (hoc est placentes domino), ante suam prevaricationem, non sciebant coitum, neque intellectum mixtionis sue carnis habuerunt; quando autem mulier manducavit de ligno (hoc est intellegibilem mandracoram), deinde dedit viro suo, pregnans malorum facta est; propter quod exierunt de paradyso. Quamdiu autem fuerunt in paradyso, non eam cognovit Adam: hoc manifestum est, quia ita scriptum est: Et postquam eiecti sunt Adam et Eva de paradyso, tunc cognovit Adam mulierem suam, et concipiens peperit Cain.<sup>2</sup>

The legend of the elephants and the mandrake, with its very special meaning for Christians, got a wide currency though on some occasions, as in the *Bestiaire* of Phillippe de Thaün, the elephants eat "mandragora," whereas Adam and Eve eat "le fruit del pumier."<sup>3</sup> Here we have a neat point, I think, that explains why Donne's Soul leaves the apple of temptation and takes refuge outside Eden in the mandrake.

We know that Eve ate an apple because the Vulgate tells us so—not in Genesis, but in Song of Songs (VIII: 5): "Sub arbore malo suscitavi te: ibi corrupta est mater tua, ibi violata est genitrix tua." This is one of those unhappy spots in Divine Writ. The Greek text keeps the appletree but says nothing about the corruption of "your mother"; the Hebrew and the English texts agree with it. But in all the texts the mandrake is close to the appletree. In VII: 13, the "Church" proposes that she and her "Spouse" go out to the vineyards where there are tender grapes and budding pomegranates; here

<sup>1</sup> F. Lauchert, *Geschichte des Physiologus* (Strassburg, 1889), pp. 271-3: "ἔστι δὲ ἐκεῖ δένδρον, μανδραγόρας λεγόμενον."

<sup>2</sup> F. J. Carmody, ed., *Physiologus Latinus Versio Y* (Berkeley, 1941): *Univ. of California Publications in Classical Philology*, XII, no. 7, pp. 117-8.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit. (Ed. Walberg, Lund, 1900), pp. 53-4.

at her gates, she remarks, are her love and fruits which she has laid up for her Lover. "Mandragorae dederunt odorem." "Οἱ μανδραγόρες ἔδωκαν ὄσμην" "הרודאים נתנו ריח" "The mandrakes diffuse fragrance." All the texts agree and point the way to Genesis XXX: 14-17, where we learn that Leah, thanks to the fecundating mandrakes, bore Jacob a fifth son.

So the mandrake is close to the Garden of Eden, has a part in the Fall, has something to do with sexual lust, and with fecundity. "No iustful woman came this plant to grieve," says Donne, and we can turn to an English version of a popular mediaeval work, *The Dialogues of Creatures Moralysed* (1535) for "Of a frute callyd Mandragora, and of the desyrous Woman."

As sayth saynt Augustyn, super Genesim Mandragora is of the kynde of an apple. And of this apple kynde, he saith, some men have opynyon if it be receyuyd in mete or drinke, it cawsith fecounditie and frutefulnessse to them that be bareyne. And for thys grete vertew which she hath, Venus, the goddessse of adultery, which exercisid her lechery with dyuers personis, went to the Mandrake & made her prayer mekely, & sayde thus: O thowe best and most frutefull tre, loke uppon me and despyse not my prayers, but grawnte me of thy goodnes to be partetaker of the, that I maye conceyue chyl dren of them that be my louers: for sothlye I am barayne, and withowte the I may not conceyue. Wherefore I pray the to here my peticyon, and aske of me what thou wolte. To whom the Mandrake sayde: O thowe most unclene of all creatures, for bothe the erthe and the ayre be corrupte and defylyd of thy stynkyng lecherye. But moch more shulde it be infecte, yf thou myghtyst bringe forth lecherows childryn that myght beholde the multiplyed and lyuyng delectablye. Goo thou fro me in all hast possible, for euyn nowe I am replete tedyouslye, and stoppid of the stenche of thyn unclennes. And so the Mandrake expulsyd her owte of her presence with confusyon to her and sayde:

Put away strompettis that drede for no shame,  
Talkynge of them shal hurte thy good name.<sup>4</sup>

The Venus of this exemplum, though she is of mediaeval provenience, is familiar enough as the heroine of *Venus and Adonis* and in her other manifestation as the tree-adoring Eve of *Paradise Lost*.

But the last stanza of "The Progresse" account celebrates the soporific virtues of the mandrake, which are recounted in all the classical and mediaeval authorities<sup>5</sup> and summed up in Iago's "Not poppy, nor mandragora." More unusual, but as a side note, is the

<sup>4</sup> *The Dialogues of Creatures Moralized* (London, 1816), pp. lxvi-lxvii.

<sup>5</sup> Plato, *Rep.*, 488 C; Xenophon, *Symp.*, 2. 24; Aristotle, *De Somn.* 3; Plutarch, *Moral.*, 15 F; Lucian, *Timon*, 2; Apuleius, *Met.* 10, 11; Pliny, 25. 150; etc.

reference to the sleeplessness of little Cain, who is clearly in Donne's thinking no twin of Abel. The story is, I expect invented by Donne, but it is invented on the basis of a bad reading of the Hebrew text of Genesis IV:1. Actually Eve translates the name *Cain*, but it is clear from the objections of sixteenth and seventeenth century exegetes on the text that some inferior Hebraists read קין as from קיו and, hence, as קינה: *lamentation, constant weeping*.

"Get with child a mandrake root," should I think be read as "get with a child the thing that gets with a child," which is a turn similar to "She's now a part both of the Quire, and Song." Or, following Donne's own commentary (that I have not found in the authorities) an elegant irony arises from: "His apples kindle, his leaves, force of conception kill."

*The Johns Hopkins University*

D. C. ALLEN

### *Queen Mab: The Inconsistency of Ahasuerus*

Four years after the printing of *Queen Mab* (1813), Shelley wrote that the poem "was composed in early youth, and is full of those errors which belong to youth, as far as arrangement of imagery and language and a connected plan, is concerned."<sup>1</sup> Quite possibly he had in mind, among other matters, his use of the Wandering Jew in the character of Ahasuerus, a figure whose two functions seem irreconcilable.

Shelley used the legend of the Wandering Jew in various works. The figure first appears as Paulo in *The Wandering Jew*, written in the winter of 1809-1810.<sup>2</sup> Here the characterization is exclusively orthodox; that is, Paulo suffers timeless pain but does not become an instrument for the poet's attack upon the conception of a deity which would cause such pain. Although Shelley might possibly have had religious doubts at this time,<sup>3</sup> these in no way influenced his

<sup>1</sup> Shelley to Mr. Waller, November 22, 1817. (*The Complete Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. Roger Ingpen and Walter E. Peck [London, 1926-1930], VII, 310).

<sup>2</sup> Newman Ivey White, *Shelley* (London, 1947), I, 580.

<sup>3</sup> White (I, 60) inferred from the characterization that Shelley did not have doubts at this time.

use of the material. In a shorter poem, "The Wandering Jew's Soliloquy," probably written in 1812,<sup>4</sup> the speaker begs for death from the "Tyrant of Earth," but he accepts the orthodox account of the Creation and Fall. The difference between Shelley's earlier use of the legend and this is merely one of evaluation of the motivation of the deity rather than of the structure of the legend itself: the protagonist is an eternal wanderer totally subject to the will of his divine persecutor.

The figure of the Wandering Jew next appears as the Stranger in *The Assassins*, a prose fragment which Shelley wrote in 1814,<sup>5</sup> the year after the printing of *Queen Mab*. Although the somewhat incoherent utterances of the Stranger at the time that Albedir discovers him clearly suggest his identity, the rest of the legend remains undeveloped. Shelley in no way committed himself to a kind of consistency had he chosen to complete the work. In *Alastor* a reference to the Wandering Jew (675-681), like the preceding mention of Medea, merely serves the needs of poetic imagery, so that the question of the poet's religious belief does not arise. Finally, what seems to be the figure of the Wandering Jew appears in *Hellas*, again as Ahasuerus. Describing Ahasuerus to Mahmud, Hassan is careful to point out that there are various reports concerning his origin and identity, and Ahasuerus himself asserts only that he, like Mahmud, is a man; beyond this he lets Mahmud infer what he will.<sup>6</sup> Ahasuerus, therefore, remains merely an abstraction in *Hellas*, the spokesman for an idealistic point of view. In this role he could have been expressly identified with Tiresias perhaps, but hardly with the Wandering Jew.

It is clear that in these other works Shelley used in two ways figures taken to be the Wandering Jew. In the first the figure is traditional, that is, one punished by a deity, who may or may not be considered unjust but whose existence is not questioned within the context of the work. In the second the figure exists apart from the legend and serves the poet's artistic or thematic purposes; his association with the Wandering Jew is at most suggested, and is used to enrich but

<sup>4</sup> White, I, 653.

<sup>5</sup> *Mary Shelley's Journal*, ed. Frederick L. Jones (Norman, Oklahoma, 1947), pp. 11, 12, 14, 16.

<sup>6</sup> In his Notes on *Hellas* Shelley wrote, "I have preferred to represent the Jew as disclaiming all pretension, or even belief, in supernatural agency" (*Works*, III, 57).

not to limit the symbolic value of the character. It is the attempt in *Queen Mab* to fuse these two functions of the figure that failed.

Queen Mab's denial of the existence of an anthropomorphic deity logically precedes her evocation of Ahasuerus, who is to demonstrate that if there were such a deity, then he would necessarily be unjust, as "vengeful as almighty" (*Queen Mab*, VII, 85). Ahasuerus reverses the terms of traditional belief, for the god that he describes creates in order to satisfy the needs of an essentially evil nature. That the notion of such a deity, or of any anthropomorphic mover of the universe, is fantastic is emphasized by the fact that Ahasuerus, who believes in this deity, is a phantom of "inessential figure" (VII, 71). To this point the character is consistent with the legend, which has been merely adapted to the poet's needs and serves him as a myth. It is at the point—following Ahasuerus's account of the Creation and Fall, the revelation to Moses, the Incarnation, and his own sufferings—at which Ahasuerus reveals his sense of triumph over his persecutor that the figure becomes inconsistent. Though apparently bound by life, he remains, he says,

Yet peaceful, and serene, and self-enshrined,  
Mocking my powerless tyrant's horrible curse  
With stubborn and unalterable will

(VII, 256-8).

He becomes an echo of the "virtuous man" appearing earlier in the poem (III, 150-160), who, though imprisoned by the evil king, is actually free and happy. Possibly he prefigures Prometheus as a type of hero,<sup>7</sup> but in coming to serve these functions, Ahasuerus ceases to move within the structure of the legend of the Wandering Jew, the essence of whose being is eternal and unqualified suffering. The Wandering Jew should seem to suit Shelley's intentions, for, having an air of unreality about him, he was obviously an effective symbol for all those who believe in the anthropomorphic deity of orthodox tradition and to whom for their belief would come only pain and, intellectually, a privation of reality. But to have this "inessential figure" triumph over his inessential persecutor is to destroy his original effectiveness. If the figure were supposed to appear in the poem in order to give expression to an idealistic philosophy, much as Ahasuerus does in *Hellas*, then he could hardly have been specifically identified

<sup>7</sup> See Carl Grabo, *The Magic Plant: The Growth of Shelley's Mind* (Chapel Hill, 1936), p. 114; White, I, 293.

with the Wandering Jew, as he has been in *Queen Mab*; or, if he were so identified, he could not consistently emerge from his experiences in idealistic triumph.

University of Pennsylvania

WILLIAM H. MARSHALL

## Tennyson's "The Epic": A Gesture of Recovered Faith

Tennyson's "The Epic," which holds as its center the "Morte d'Arthur," has often been misapprehended, mainly because of biographical or historical disposition of its critical questions. The somewhat misleading background of the poem is as follows: Tennyson wrote a draft of the "Morte" at least as early as 1835;<sup>1</sup> supposedly dissatisfied with the "Morte" in itself, he added a contemporary colloquy, sections of which open and close the entire poem (now entitled "The Epic"), for the 1842 *Poems*. It has been assumed that the new material was to serve as an apology for the "Morte," and that the two parts were antagonistic one to the other, even in style. This assumption has tended to obscure the interrelation of the two parts. "The Epic," as I will hope to show, is one poem, consistent within itself, which presents a defense and recovery of heroic attitudes, of an heroic form of literature (the epic), and of Christian faith.

Edward FitzGerald's offhand treatment of both "Morte" and its so-called "frame," which apparently reflected Tennyson's attitude, perhaps is responsible for the misapprehension. FitzGerald believed that the frame was attached to "anticipate or excuse" the "Morte" and "to give a reason for telling an old-world tale."<sup>2</sup> Later critics have tended to accept the dichotomy implied by FitzGerald. Paull F. Baum, for example, terms the frame a *jeu d'esprit*, as though it were a lighthearted animadversion upon the "Morte."<sup>3</sup> Joyce Green,

<sup>1</sup> So dated by FitzGerald's notes in Hallam Tennyson's *Alfred, Lord Tennyson: a Memoir* (New York and London, 1897), I, 194. For evidence of earlier composition, see W. D. Paden, *Tennyson in Egypt* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1942), p. 159, n. 226.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoir*, I, 194.

<sup>3</sup> *Tennyson Sixty Years After* (Chapel Hill, 1948), p. 156.

intent upon the period of composition, finds a somewhat closer relation between the parts, in that the frame's "promised return of King Arthur, and of triumphant faith, was bound up with the hope of Hallam's survival,"<sup>4</sup> but acknowledges that this relation is only a "nuance of personal reference." Stopford Brooke comments upon the frame's associating of the Arthurian tale with Christian faith;<sup>5</sup> however, his remarks fail to note the poem's concern with poetry as well as with Christianity. Paul Goodman has drawn attention to the central role of Bedivere in the "Morte," but is concerned with Bedivere's role as narrator of the *Idylls* rather than with his relationship to the modern men of "The Epic."<sup>6</sup> None of these otherwise excellent studies has definitely put down the idea that the poem is composed of two ill-related parts.

"The Epic," it is true, does begin as an excuse for the "Morte." The Tennyson-like poet dramatized in the frame, "Everard Hall," says that the "Morte" is the eleventh book of an Arthurian epic that he has destroyed, feeling that an epic was anachronistic, a "remodeled model"; it had only "Homeric echoes" rather than a presently meaningful subject and style. Although the host, Francis Allen, has salvaged it from the fire, he dismisses it as a "sugar-plum" fit only for the sentimental parson, Holmes. Although the company of friends insists upon hearing the "Morte," each assumes that it is a mere curiosity. All this evidence seems to support the belief that in the frame Tennyson was dismissing the "Morte."

However, as the poem proceeds, each of the attitudes of Hall and his friends comes to be condemned. In the end, the contemporary men are rebuked for lack of faith, and the speaker finds his faith in humanity and God reestablished *through the example* of the "Morte." The whole poem presents the "Morte" as an agency of faith and its effect as a gesture of that faith.

As "The Epic" opens, the decay of Christian faith is seen to be general; Christmas has lost its meaning. Although the modern men deplore the loss of faith, they share in it. The parson, Holmes, lays the blame to "Geology and schism." His lament is given grounds which at first seem only comic but which, in the general context, become pathetic, if not tragic: the host believes only in the poet, but

<sup>4</sup> "Tennyson's Development during the 'Ten Years' Silence,'" *PMLA*, LXVI (1951), 672.

<sup>5</sup> *Tennyson: His Art and Relation to Modern Life* (New York and London, 1894), pp. 131-32.

<sup>6</sup> *The Structure of Literature* (Chicago, 1954), pp. 221-23.

the poet now believes only in the wassail-bowl—Christ and Communion have been abandoned for one uncertain poet seeking a punch-bowl. Thereby the second indictment of loss of faith arises: the poet, together with the company, no longer believes in poetry. He evidently abandoned his gift after leaving college, for the speaker asks of his poetry, "What came of that?"

The poet answers that the "Morte" shares the defect of its kind, that the epic as a genre is as dead as the heroic eras it presented: "nature brings not back the Mastodon." The inference is clear. Nature has, so the modern men believe, evolved beyond heroism and any magnificent form. Beyond the impulse toward contemporary style and subjects lies the suggestion that progress has been, in reality, degeneration, and that modern man is incapable of heroism and poetry.

The "Morte" follows, read by Hall, the apostate from his own gift. In it, Bedivere becomes almost a type of the modern man. He is instructed by Arthur toward an act of faith but twice fails of the charge, for the "modern" reasons of materialism and rationalism. Upon the third trial, he flings Excalibur into the lake without sight or thought, thereby accomplishing Arthur's miraculous passing. However, he is still infirm in faith. As he looks upon the dying Arthur, he fears—in words almost repeating those of the modern men—that faith and heroism are past:

. . . now I see the true old times are dead,  
When every morning brought a noble chance,  
And every chance brought out a noble knight.  
Such times have been not since the light that led  
The holy Elders with the gift of myrrh.

His despondent allusion to the celebration of Christ's birth brings Bedivere even more firmly into company with the moderns. Arthur's reproving instruction thereby bears double relevance in the poem. The king insists upon a faith accepting of and concurrent with change, and turns Bedivere's attention to aspiration, through prayer, toward such faith. Although the "Morte" closes upon the passing of Arthur, the concentration of attention has been throughout upon Bedivere's two offices of instruction: first, toward the instructed act of faith, and second, toward prayer, which is the personal affirmation and gesture of faith. The knight is brought to accept the passing of Arthur as not an end but a beginning.

As "The Epic" resumes its modern scene, Parson Holmes, who supposedly had most sympathy with the epic, and was most mournful

over the decay of faith, is found asleep; he did not watch one hour. But the others—the contemporary Bediveres—“sat rapt.” The speaker tries to explain away their response, but that night dreams of Arthur, in appearance like a “modern gentleman” (that is, the “Mastodon,” as a metaphor for the image and meaning of human greatness, *can* return), undying. Watchers on the hills cry out that Arthur has come again, altering the image of Arthur gradually into that of Christ: “Come / With all good things, and war shall be no more.” The speaker, now returned to belief, awakes to hear church bells ringing in the timeless celebration of Christmas.

The poem ends by driving its point of Christian revival so insistently that the other recoveries of faith may be missed. The faith of heroic ages in human greatness is recovered and validated through the “rapt” response of a modern audience to the hero, Arthur. Just as Arthur has insisted that change does not imply destruction, the modern men realize that, although heroism may change in modes, neither its meaning nor its present possibility need alter. Perhaps more importantly, the poem comes to insist upon the validity of the epic as a literary concept, in effect recovering through the “Morte” faith in poetry itself. In this matter, the title is important. Although “The Epic” is in one sense about the eleventh book of a discarded epic, it is, in a larger sense, about the concept of epic—not necessarily as a genre, but as a magnificent form, great poetically and great in its dedication to an heroic human action. Although the poem begins in depreciation of poetry, it concludes upon the speaker’s re-entry into faith in and through its offices. The “Morte” is to the modern men as Arthur’s instructions were to Bedivere; through its instructive action, they recover hope of human significance and of its practice in their own persons.

In the *Idylls*, of course, the “Morte,” as “The Passing of Arthur,” is placed in a different context, there betokening an end, and standing in only a pathetic relationship to Arthur’s mission. That eventual use of the “Morte” should not, however, prevent our seeing the almost opposite use to which the Arthurian material is put in “The Epic,” in which it produces an affirmation of faith in Christ, in human greatness, and in poetry.

Ball State Teachers College

J. S. LAWRY

## Hawthorne: Mr. Hooper's "Affable Weakness"

Critics of Hawthorne's "The Minister's Black Veil" have been as fascinated by Mr. Hooper's enigmatic piece of crape as were the minister's own congregation, and, like them, have offered conflicting opinions concerning its significance. Some critics are willing to accept Mr. Hooper's own reasons for wearing it as Hawthorne's, while others prefer to find the answer in what they consider the minister's warped personality, although they fail to comprehend all the facets of that personality.<sup>1</sup> Building on the theory of the latter group, this paper will show that "The Minister's Black Veil" is a psychological study of a man whose mistaken notions about the nature of evil prompt him to attempt the salvation of his fellow men by a method which seriously endangers his own salvation: the donning of the black veil.

Mr. Hooper's deathbed remarks show that he intended the black veil to symbolize the secret sin which *all* men "loathsomely treasure up" in their hearts.<sup>2</sup> That he intended himself to typify mankind's evil nature is clear enough, but the reason why he thought himself evil not so clear. Nevertheless, it can be found in an examination of his character prior to wearing the veil. We learn that he was always "reckoned a melancholy man" (I, 58) whose temperament was that of "gentle gloom" (I, 55). But, more important, we learn that ". . . he had never lacked advisers, nor shown himself adverse to be guided by their judgment. If he erred at all, it was by so painful a degree of self-distrust, that even the mildest censure would lead him to consider an indifferent action as a crime" (I, 60). This self-distrust, which the author calls an "affable weakness," explains the donning of the veil, for Mr. Hooper is a man who suffers from an affliction not uncommon to men of religious sensibilities: scrupulosity. If this melancholy man can not distinguish between an indifferent action and a crime, it is not surprising that he should eventually con-

<sup>1</sup> Chester E. Eisinger in his article, "Hawthorne as Champion of the Middle Way," *NEQ*, xxvii (March, 1954), 27-52, finds Hooper's indictment "an expression of what for Hawthorne was the common fate of all men" (p. 28), and Newton Arvin calls it a "terrible truth" (*Hawthorne* [Boston, 1929], p. 60). On the other hand, Randall Stewart speaks of Mr. Hooper's "diseased self contemplation" (*Nathaniel Hawthorne: A Biography* [New Haven, 1948], p. 256), and Richard Fogle speaks of him as a man "who severs himself from men either through perverse pride or through some tragic compulsion" (*Hawthorne's Fiction: The Light and the Dark* [Norman, Oklahoma, 1952], p. 34).

<sup>2</sup> *The Complete Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne*, with Introductory Notes by George Parsons Lathrop (Standard Library Edition, Boston, 1883), I, 69. Subsequent reference to the tale will be made in the text.

sider all his actions crimes and himself intrinsically evil, and then, by extention, all mankind. His donning of the veil is an indication of that conviction and a symptom of his troubled soul. It is interesting to note that the minister communicates his own inability to discriminate between an indifferent action and a crime to his congregation. This is illustrated by the effect of one of his sermons: "Each member of the congregation, the most innocent girl, and the man of hardened breast, felt as if the preacher had crept upon them, behind his awful veil, and discovered their hoarded iniquity of deed and thought" (I, 55). It is one thing that he should make the truly guilty feel their guilt, but quite another to transfer his own neurotic guilt complex to the innocent, making them feel *as if* they were hoarding iniquity of deed and thought in their hearts.

But the wearing of the veil does not indicate that the minister despairs of his own and his congregation's salvation; on the contrary, it is motivated by his hope for peace of mind in the after-life: "'It is but a mortal veil—it is not for eternity!'" he tells Elizabeth, his betrothed (I, 63). In another passage we read of his "tender and heart-dissolving prayer, full of sorrow, yet . . . imbued with celestial hopes" (I, 58). But, ironically, the veil's effect on the minister is almost opposite to that which he intended.

The light-dark imagery of the tale clearly reveals what harm the veil works in Mr. Hooper's soul. For instance, one passage reads:

Thus, from beneath the black veil, there rolled a cloud into the sunshine, . . . which enveloped the poor minister, so that love or sympathy could never reach him. . . . With self-shuddering and outward terrors, he walked in its shadow, groping darkly within his own soul, or gazing through a medium that saddened the world (I, 65).

And another passage:

All through life that piece of crepe had hung between him and the world: it had separated him from cheerful brotherhood and woman's love . . . and still it lay upon his face, as if to deepen the gloom of his darksome chamber, and shade him from the sunshine of eternity (I, 67).

The images of these two passages make explicit the devastating effects of the veil. Sunshine is equated with love and sympathy, cheerful brotherhood and woman's love, and with eternity; the black veil has separated him from the former and threatens to shade him from the latter. (The sunshine image has the same significance in Elizabeth's

exhortation to the minister in an earlier passage: "'Come, good sir, let the sun shine behind the cloud'.") But before we can conclude that the minister is altogether doomed, as are other characters in Hawthorne's fiction who sever themselves from the natural affections of mankind, we must take special notice of Mr. Hooper's smile.

The minister's smile is mentioned eight times and is associated with the light image. For instance, "He smiled again—that same sad smile, which always appeared like a faint glimmering of light, proceeding from the obscurity beneath the veil" (I, 62). In four passages it is described as glimmering or gleaming. It is also generally described as faint. From the smile-light association, then, we can conclude that the smile betokens the minister's tenuous ties with his fellow men and his shaky hold on his own sanity. It indicates that he has not been completely enveloped by the terrifying black veil which has multiplied his doubts about his own salvation. This conclusion becomes irresistible when we remember a most important fact about the veil: "it . . . entirely concealed his features, except the mouth and chin" (I, 53).

The veil-dark imagery is balanced against the smile-light imagery throughout the tale, and from it arises the true ambiguity of the tale: we can never be sure of the minister's final destiny because the minister is not sure of it. Hawthorne carries this ambiguity down to the last paragraph, the smile image once again balanced against the veil image: "Father Hooper fell back upon his pillow, a veiled corpse, with a faint smile lingering on the lips . . . but awful is still the thought that his face mouldered beneath the Black Veil!" (I, 69).

Certain parallels can be drawn between the characters of Mr. Hooper and Goodman Brown. Both are essentially good men and both are mistaken in their belief in the all-pervasiveness of evil, but the difference is that the latter is overwhelmed by his diabolic vision whereas the former is perhaps saved by his strong celestial aspirations. Both redound to the credit of Hawthorne's artistry, that he could create two completely distinctive psychological variations on the same theme.

*Georgetown University*

THOMAS F. WALSH

## Typee and Milton: Paradise Well Lost

Several of Melville's critics have remarked that the Typee valley, in *Typee*, represents in some sense an unfallen Paradise; and Richard Chase has suggested that it represents a *fallen* Paradise.<sup>1</sup> But only one, I believe, has noted that Typee specifically resembles Milton's Paradise. While discussing *Paradise Lost* and *Typee*, Henry F. Pommer says, "Melville and Milton had surprisingly congruous visions of what the world would be if man had not introduced wrong to adulterate God's ways . . ."; he then points out the similarity between W. E. Sedgwick's statement (here much abbreviated) that *Typee* expresses the "universal phase of human experience . . . in which life lies along the easy slopes of spontaneous, instinctive being, . . . in which as yet no painful cleavage is felt dividing a happy animality from the gentlest and most guileless impulses of the heart," and P. E. More's statement that the real theme of *Paradise Lost* is "that ancient ineradicable longing of the human heart for a garden of innocence, a paradise of idyllic delights."<sup>2</sup> Professor Pommer does not develop this parallel further, and he names only two specifically Miltonic echoes in the novel: an allusion to the apples of Sodom, and a use of the phrase "face divine."<sup>3</sup>

Actually, the parallel is more extensive, more detailed, and more complex; it is unquestionably deliberate. First, before citing the passages which echo specific scenes in *Paradise Lost*, we shall note some of the general similarities between Milton's pre-Fall Paradise and the Typee valley. Milton's Paradise has "eternal spring"; the Typee weather is invariably pleasant, like late June.<sup>4</sup> The abundance of fruit and vegetables in Typee, as in Eden, is entirely natural: "not a single atom of the soil was under any other cultivation than that of shower and sunshine."<sup>5</sup> The creatures in Eden do not fear man before the Fall; in Typee, the only creatures which show the slightest fear of man are those characteristic of civilization—dogs and a cat—

<sup>1</sup> R. W. B. Lewis, *The American Adam* (Chicago, 1955), p. 135; Lewis Mumford, *Herman Melville* (N. Y., 1929), p. 72; D. H. Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature* (N. Y., 1923), pp. 199-200; Chase, *Herman Melville: A Critical Study* (N. Y., 1949), pp. 32, 35.

<sup>2</sup> *Milton and Melville* (Pittsburgh, 1950), p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> *Milton and Melville*, pp. 30, 66-67, 113.

<sup>4</sup> *PL*, IV, 168; in all quotations from *Paradise Lost*, the text is that of *The Poems of John Milton*, ed. Hanford (N. Y., 1936). *The Complete Works of Herman Melville*, Vol. I: *Typee*, Standard Edition (London, 1922-1924), p. 287.

<sup>5</sup> *Typee*, p. 221.

and Tommo calls them "interlopers" from some "ugly country," perhaps escaped from a ship.<sup>6</sup> Like Adam and Eve, the Typee natives have no troubles: ". . . I was well disposed to think that I was in the 'Happy Valley,' and that beyond those heights there was nought but a world of care and anxiety. . . . There seemed to be no cares, griefs, troubles, or vexations in all Typee."<sup>7</sup> Tommo states that the Typees never quarrel.<sup>8</sup> They have no congenital deformities, and sickness is almost unknown among them.<sup>9</sup> Like Adam and Eve, the Typees are physically beautiful, much more so than the nearby Nukuheva natives; nearly every Typee "might have been taken for a sculptor's model."<sup>10</sup> Twice Melville speaks of their wearing the "garb of Eden."<sup>11</sup> Their daily life is very appropriate to an unfallen Paradise. They are free from any harsh labor: "The penalty of the Fall presses very lightly upon the valley of Typee; for, with the one solitary exception of striking a light, I scarcely saw any piece of work performed there which caused the sweat to stand upon a single brow."<sup>12</sup> Yet, again like Adam and Eve, they are never bored by the lack of what Adam calls "pleasant labor": ". . . these innocent people seemed to be at no loss for something to occupy their time; and it would be no light task to enumerate all their employments, or rather pleasures."<sup>13</sup>

Fayaway is the Eve of this Eden, as several of Melville's critics have noted;<sup>14</sup> the evidence is her extraordinary beauty and charm. Tommo's remark that "Fayaway . . . for the most part clung to the primitive and summer garb of Eden," and various passages describing this "child of Nature . . . , breathing from infancy an atmosphere of perpetual summer, and nurtured by the simple fruits of the earth, enjoying a perfect freedom from care and anxiety, and removed effectually from all injurious tendencies."<sup>15</sup>

One conspicuous allusion to *Paradise Lost* is the scene in which Tommo and Toby first glimpse two Typee natives: "a boy and girl, slender and graceful, and completely naked, with the exception of a slight girdle of bark, from which depended at opposite points two of the russet leaves of the bread-fruit tree. An arm of the boy, half-screened from sight by her wild tresses, was thrown about the neck

<sup>6</sup> *PL*, iv, 340-350; *Typee*, pp. 283-284.

<sup>7</sup> *Typee*, pp. 165, 168.

<sup>8</sup> *Typee*, p. 275.

<sup>9</sup> *Typee*, pp. 242, 170.

<sup>10</sup> Lewis, *American Adam*, p. 135; Lawrence, *Studies*, p. 200.

<sup>11</sup> *Typee*, pp. 116, 115.

<sup>12</sup> *Typee*, pp. 244, 243.

<sup>13</sup> *Typee*, pp. 116, 243.

<sup>14</sup> *Typee*, p. 262.

<sup>15</sup> *PL*, iv, 625; *Typee*, p. 202.

of the girl, while with the other he held one of her hands in his. . . ."<sup>16</sup>  
This recalls the famous scene in which Satan first views Adam and Eve:

Two of far nobler shape and tall,  
God-like erect, with native honor clad  
In naked majesty. . . .  
She as a veil down to the slender waist  
Her unadorned golden tresses wore  
Dishevelled. . . .  
So hand in hand they passed, the loveliest pair  
That ever since in love's embraces met. . . ."<sup>17</sup>

Both descriptions contain "slender," "naked," and "tresses"; the girl's hair ("wild"), like Eve's ("dishevelled"), acts as a veil; both couples are hand in hand.

If the Typees still live in an unfallen Paradise, one reason is that they have successfully resisted the invasion of European traders and missionaries. Repeatedly Melville insists that whatever savagery, vice, and misery exist among the Pacific natives have been caused by their "contaminating contact" with white men, in which the natives "fold to their bosoms the vipers whose sting is destined to poison all their joys."<sup>18</sup> In other words, the Pacific tribes were related to the Europeans very much as the inhabitants of Paradise were related to the Serpent. The fact, therefore, that the central character of *Typee*, Tommo, is a white man almost entirely under the influence and authority of the Typees emphasizes the unfallen state of the Typee valley. To stress the meaning of this situation, Melville symbolically identifies Tommo's entrance into the Typee valley with Satan's entrance into Paradise, as described by Milton.

The first hint of this identification appears when, after deserting their ship, Tommo and his friend Toby crawl on hands and knees so as to avoid the natives' notice, "screened from observation by the grass through which we glided, much in the fashion of a couple of serpents."<sup>19</sup> After an extremely arduous journey, Tommo awakens one morning and, from the edge of a precipice, views the Typee valley for the first time: "Had a glimpse of the gardens of Paradise been revealed to me I could scarcely have been more ravished with the sight."<sup>20</sup> This unmistakably recalls the scene in which Satan, looking

<sup>16</sup> *Typee*, p. 90.

<sup>17</sup> *PL*, iv, 288-290, 304-306, 321-322.

<sup>18</sup> *Typee*, pp. 14, 25-26.

<sup>19</sup> *Typee*, p. 51.

<sup>20</sup> *Typee*, p. 64.

down from the outer sphere after his wild journey through Chaos, first views the Earth; Milton's simile makes the association even stronger:

As when a scout  
Through dark and desert ways with peril gone  
All night, at last by break of cheerful dawn  
Obtains the brow of some high-climbing hill,  
Which to his eye discovers unaware  
The goodly prospect of some foreign land  
First seen. . . .<sup>21</sup>

Later, burning with fever, Tommo tries to drink from the inviting water of a stream, but his illness makes the water suddenly seem loathsome: "Had the apples of Sodom turned to ashes in my mouth, I could not have felt a more startling revulsion."<sup>22</sup> Pommer notes that the allusion is to *Paradise Lost*; we may add that it is specifically to Satan and the fallen angels.<sup>23</sup> Tommo's illness itself, afflicting him with alternate fever and chills, helps to identify him with Satan; Milton's Hell is of alternate fire and ice, and even while Satan approaches Eden,

. . . within him Hell  
He brings, and round about him, nor from Hell  
One step no more than from himself can fly  
By change of place.<sup>24</sup>

And as we have already seen, Tommo's glimpse of the Typee boy and girl specifically recalls Satan's first glimpse of Adam and Eve.

Even before Tommo realizes that he is among the Typees, however, the novel hints that this invasion will end differently from that described by Milton. Unlike Milton's Eden, the Typee valley contains no snakes.<sup>25</sup> Tommo and Toby represent the Serpent, but only they suffer thereby: although Tommo later denies that "venomous reptiles" are found on the island, he suspects that the infection in his leg has been caused by one, and when Toby first sees the young native couple, he recoils "as if stung by an adder."<sup>26</sup> In spite of the naive appearance of the Typee boy and girl, they turn the tables on the invaders (unlike Adam and Eve) by pretending to be Happers: ". . . a couple of wilier young things than we afterwards found them

<sup>21</sup> *PL*, III, 543-549.

<sup>22</sup> *Typee*, pp. 70-71.

<sup>23</sup> *Milton and Melville*, p. 113; *PL*, x, 550-567.

<sup>24</sup> *PL*, II, 596-603, IV, 20-23.

<sup>25</sup> *Typee*, pp. 64, 286.

<sup>26</sup> *Typee*, pp. 286, 64, 89.

to have been on this particular occasion never probably fell in any traveller's way."<sup>27</sup>

In most respects, of course, the entrance of Tommo into Typee, ill, starving, and frightened, could hardly differ more from the entrance of Satan, powerful and confident, into Paradise. Satan is affected only once by his victim—when Eve's beauty and innocence render him "stupidly good"<sup>28</sup>—and his influence upon her is irresistible and disastrous; Tommo, although he adopts the dress, diet, and crafts of the Typees, is able in return to teach only one thing to only one native: how to make pop-guns. Satan is a destructive force, bent upon ruining Paradise; Tommo behaves as if the idyllic Typee valley meant *his* ruin. At the beginning of the novel, he escapes from an inordinately long sea-voyage, with brutal treatment and scanty, unsavory provisions; but at the end of the novel he escapes with even greater desperation from a life precisely the opposite of this, in the Typee valley.

The symbolic identification with Satan reminds us that Tommo, however personally harmless, is a member of that corrupt and Satanic civilization which had spoiled so many Polynesian Paradises. Tommo himself argues that the white civilized man is "the most ferocious animal on the face of the earth."<sup>29</sup> But Tommo's helplessness, his illness, and his desire to escape suggest also a more important theme: that modern man, in spite of his longing for "a garden of innocence, a paradise of idyllic delights," would find such a place unbearable. Modern man and Paradise are mutually destructive. This theme in *Typee* has been noted by several of the novel's critics. Richard Chase calls the Typee valley "an archaic level of existence which wears the mask of childhood and innocence but is really guilty of terrible crimes and which in its devious way traps unwary young voyagers."<sup>30</sup> R. W. B. Lewis says, ". . . Melville realized . . . that there [was] danger of permanently arrested development. 'That mortal man,' Ishmael would say for him, 'who hath more of joy than sorrow in him, that mortal man cannot be true—not true or undeveloped.'"<sup>31</sup> And D. H. Lawrence sums it up: "We can't go back."<sup>32</sup>

University of Washington

ROBERT STANTON

<sup>27</sup> *Typee*, pp. 91-92.

<sup>28</sup> *PL*, ix, 465.

<sup>29</sup> *Typee*, p. 167.

<sup>30</sup> *Herman Melville: A Critical Study*, p. 32.

<sup>31</sup> *American Adam*, p. 136.

<sup>32</sup> *Studies*, p. 203.

## The Alleged Sources of Girart D'Amiens's *Charlemagne*

According to repeated statements throughout his epic, Girart d'Amiens drew the material for *Charlemagne* from three principal sources: (1) the *Chronicles of Saint Denis*; (2) the *Chronicles of Aix*; and (3) *Pope Leo's Decretal*.<sup>1</sup> The first of these sources is clearly *Les Grandes Chroniques de France* as it has long been known that the first forty folios of Book II of Girart's epic are simply a metrical version of Primat's chronicle.<sup>2</sup> I have, moreover, shown elsewhere that Book III of *Charlemagne*, long assumed to have been an independent translation of the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, is, in reality, entirely dependent upon the French translation of *Turpin* in *Les Grandes Chroniques*.<sup>3</sup> The purpose of this note is to clarify Girart's allusion to the *Chronicles of Aix* and to identify, for the first time, *Pope Leo's Decretal*.

Before the discovery of the *Mainet* fragment in 1874, Gaston Paris considered Girart's claim to have found the narrative of his *Enfances Charlemagne*, i. e. Book I of his epic, "A Ais tout droitement dedenz la mestre eglyse" to be a pure fabrication of the author.<sup>4</sup> After examining *Mainet*, however, Gaston Paris was quick to realize that Girart d'Amiens doubtless utilized this epic as the basis for Book I of *Charlemagne* which in turn explains his allusion to Aix-la-Chapelle. A passage in *Mainet* reads as follows: "Il est escrit es livres de l'anciene geste / Et el grant apolice a Ais a le Capele. . ."<sup>5</sup> It would seem to follow, then, that this also explains Girart's allusion to *li vraiz croniques d'Ais* in Book III. Not at all, says Gaston Paris, in a later study: "En terminant, Girard s'en réfère encore aux chroniques d'Aix; mais ici il faut sans doute entendre la Vie de

<sup>1</sup> Gaston Paris, *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1905), p. 94. *Pope Leo's Decretal* is not mentioned by Gaston Paris in his notice "Girard d'Amiens" in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xxxi (Paris, 1893), 151-205, the only full-dress study to date on this author. The great medievalist refers repeatedly in the *Histoire poétique de décrétales*, that is, papal bulls. All three manuscripts of *Charlemagne* support the view that Girart intended this word to be read in the singular, not the plural.

<sup>2</sup> *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne*, pp. 94, 478-479.

<sup>3</sup> See my forthcoming contribution entitled "Girart d'Amiens and the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*" in *ZRPh*.

<sup>4</sup> *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne*, p. 492.

<sup>5</sup> Gaston Paris, "Mainet," *Romania*, iv (1875), 313-314. Cf. *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xxxi, 200.

Charlemagne rédigée à Aix en 1165, dans laquelle ont été intercalées la légende du voyage en Orient et la fabuleuse relation de Turpin."\*

The Latin *Vita Karoli Magni* to which Gaston Paris alludes here was composed in the 1180's for Frederick Barbarossa.<sup>7</sup> This prose work exerted a considerable influence in the Middle Ages, but especially in Germany, and I see absolutely no reason for assuming that Girart was referring to it here.<sup>8</sup> It is significant that the *Vita* contains only the first seven chapters of *Turpin* whereas Book III of *Charlemagne* contains thirty of the thirty-three chapters. It is more plausible, then, that the supposed source to which Girart d'Amiens was alluding in Book III was the same as the one in Books I and II. Aix-la-Chapelle was one of the major centers of diffusion of the Carolingian legend, the site of the Emperor's celebrated palace and his burial place. Girart was endeavoring to give his epic a seal of authenticity by alluding to "chronicles" connected with Charlemagne's capital.<sup>9</sup>

The nature of *Pope Leo's Decretal* is more elusive. Gaston Paris was at a loss to explain Girart's allusion to ". . . le decret / Que saint Lyon en fist qui nous va devisant / Moulit des fez de Challon et de son nies Rollant,"<sup>10</sup> that is, some sort of history of Charlemagne and Roland to be found in a papal bull composed by Saint Leo:

Nous avons déjà dit plus haut (page 94) que Girard d'Amiens, dans le troisième livre de son *Charlemagne*, invoque l'autorité de saint Léon, qui aurait raconté la guerre d'Espagne dans des *décrets* authentiques (voyez le passage même ci-dessus, p. 482). Cependant son récit ne contient rien qui ne se trouve dans *Turpin*, et aucun texte ne parle de ces prétendues décrétales de saint Léon. Girard a sans doute entendu le pape Léon III, contemporain et ami de Charlemagne, et s'est avisé de son chef de le prendre pour garant de ce qu'il raconte.<sup>11</sup>

A considerable amount of legendary material developed around the figure of Pope Leo III in the Middle Ages and, just as the very name Aix-la-Chapelle automatically evoked the figure of Charlemagne in all

\* *HLF*, xxxi, 201.

<sup>7</sup> Edition by Gerhard Rauschen in *Die Legende Karls des Grossen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1890). See Robert Folz, *Le Souvenir et la légende de Charlemagne dans l'empire germanique médiéval* (Paris, 1950), pp. 214-221 et passim.

<sup>8</sup> On the manuscript tradition of the *Vita* (and the *Pseudo-Turpin*), see Folz, pp. 235-237. See also the references listed in his Index, svv. *Vita S. Karoli*. I know of no Old French translation of this *Vita*.

<sup>9</sup> On Aix-la-Chapelle in the Carolingian legend, consult Folz, Index, s. v.

<sup>10</sup> Bibliothèque Nationale, *fonds français* 778 (olim 7188), folio 143b. I am preparing a critical edition of the unpublished *Charlemagne*.

<sup>11</sup> *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne*, p. 492.

his glory to the medieval reader, the words *saint Lyon* brought to mind the legends surrounding the vague memory of the Emperor's historical association with the pope who crowned him.<sup>12</sup> In Germany, Pope Leo was believed to have been Charlemagne's brother, while in France the most widespread legend concerns the miraculous restitution of the Pope's blinded eyesight and mutilated tongue (e. g. Philippe Mouskés). But the word *decret* alludes to a specific document associated with the Charlemagne legend, more specifically with the *fez de Challon et de son nies Rollant* as found in the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* (compare Girart's expression with the usual title of Turpin's fictitious narrative: *Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi*). Girart's allusion to *le decret saint Lyon* is explainable only in the light of the little-noted document known as the *Lesser Translation*.

In a number of manuscripts of the *Pseudo-Turpin*, the text of the chronicle is preceded by a document known as the *Translation*.<sup>13</sup> This well-known forgery relates how Saint James came to Spain and made a number of converts there before his martyrdom in Jerusalem. The *Translation* then narrates that seven of the Apostle's disciples brought his body back to Spain where, after many difficulties, the disciples were able to find a suitable place for the saint's burial. In typically medieval fashion, two other forgeries certified the authenticity of this document in the *Codex Calixtinus* which contains the earliest known manuscript of *Turpin*: the *Prologue*, a letter purporting to be from Pope Calixtus II (died 1124), exhorting the faithful to accept as true to fact the narrative which follows,<sup>14</sup> and the *Lesser Translation*, another false bull reiterating, with some embellishments, the claims of the *Translation*.<sup>15</sup> As the *Lesser Translation* is supposed to have emanated from none other than Pope Leo III (795-816) and as he was believed to have been a contemporary of the reputed discovery

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., pp. 406-407, 421-423. Folz, Index, s. v. *Léon III, pape*. On the historical events involving Leo III and Charlemagne, see Louis Halphen, *Charlemagne et l'empire carolingien* (Paris, 1947), pp. 75, 121-123, 126-129, et passim.

<sup>13</sup> Edition in *Liber Sancti Jacobi. Codex Calixtinus*, ed. Walter Muir Whitehill (Santiago de Compostela, 1944), I, 290-294.

<sup>14</sup> Whitehill, op. cit., 289-290. See also *Bullaire du Pape Calixte II*, ed. Ulysse Robert (Paris, 1891), II, 261-262, no. 449, and *Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi*, ed. C. Meredith-Jones (Paris, 1936), pp. 251-255. See discussions of this false bull in Robert, I, lxxxi-lxxxii and idem, *Histoire du Pape Calixte II* (Paris and Besançon, 1891), 205-217, and Meredith-Jones, pp. 67-71, 339-341.

<sup>15</sup> Whitehill, op. cit., 294-296. See also Henrique Florez, *España sagrada*, 2d ed., III (Madrid, 1754), 407-408.

of the Apostle's burial place in Spain, this document carried considerable weight in the Middle Ages. It matters little that the Pseudo-Leo in its final form represented a third and grossly distorted version of a ninth-century forgery with an imaginary "Leo," supposed to have been a contemporary of Saint James, as the author.<sup>16</sup> When Girart d'Amiens was writing *Charlemagne*, the *Lesser Translation* had been identified with Pope Leo III for at least a century and a half. Most pertinent to the matter at hand, however, is the fact that the Pseudo-Leo had for perhaps an equal amount of time been intimately associated with the manuscript tradition of the *Turpin Chronicle*.<sup>17</sup> Girart d'Amiens' claim that the narrative contained in Book III of *Charlemagne* was drawn from Pope Leo's epistle is thus a confusion resulting from the fact that the *Lesser Translation* precedes the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* in many manuscripts of the Latin history.

Curiously enough, allusions to Pope Leo III are more than appropriate in an epic commissioned by Charles de Valois, a candidate to the Empire in 1308.<sup>18</sup> The exact rôle played by Leo in the crowning of Charlemagne in the year 800 was a moot point variously interpreted by the political tract-writers of Girart's day. The partisans of the German right to the Imperial throne always minimized the Pope's rôle. Alexander of Roes, for example, attempting to justify the exclusive right of the Germans to the Empire in the latter part of the

<sup>16</sup> L. Duchesne, "Saint Jacques en Galice," *Annales du Midi*, XII (1900), 166-173, 178-179.

<sup>17</sup> *Pope Leo's Epistle* is found on folio 160 of the *Codex Calixtinus* (see Meredith-Jones, page 45). It precedes *Turpin* in Bibliothèque Nationale, *nouveau fonds latin* 13774 (see Meredith-Jones, p. 6) and Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MS. 1617 (see *The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, ed. H. M. Smyser [Cambridge, Mass., 1937], pp. 3, 5, 6). It is also contained in Munich, Stadtbibliothek, Clm. 11319 (Polling 19) (see Folz, p. 235, n. 175). The Pseudo-Leo is perhaps contained in other MSS of *Turpin*. For a complete list of the *Turpin* manuscripts, see Adalbert Hämel, "Los manuscritos latinos del falso Turpino," *Estudios dedicados a Menéndez Pidal*, IV (Madrid, 1953), 67-85.

<sup>18</sup> Léon Gautier, *Les Epopées françaises*, 2d ed., II (Paris, 1892), 422, was the first to suggest the possible connections between Charles de Valois' imperial ambitions and the subject of Girart's epic. Joseph Petit, *Charles de Valois (1270-1325)* (Paris, 1900), pp. 225-226, re-examined Gautier's loose assertions and presented a solid argumentation in favor of dating *Charlemagne* around 1308. Petit's dating has, unfortunately, escaped the attention of scholars. For the best study of the events leading up to the 1308 election, see Edmund Stengel, *Arignon und Rhens* (Weimar, 1930), Chapter I. More recent studies include Gaston Zeller, "Les Rois de France candidats à l'Empire," *Revue Historique*, CLXXIII (1934), 273-311, 497-534, and H. S. Lucas, "The Low Countries and the Disputed Imperial Election of 1314," *Speculum*, XXI (1946), 72-114. See also, Folz, p. 394.

thirteenth century, claimed that Leo had merely been the instrument of God (the Empire was, therefore, not the personal gift of Pope Leo to Charlemagne) and that, moreover, German candidates could point to a certain hereditary tradition in the person of the Frankish, i.e. Teutonic, Charlemagne.<sup>10</sup>

To show, then, by the life and deeds of Charlemagne as preserved in the *chansons de geste*, that the Emperor was truly French and to imply that future candidates should therefore also be French, such was doubtless the motive of Charles de Valois in commissioning his epic. This is not to say that *Charlemagne* is a political treatise. It is, of course, far from being that, for, essentially, it is a retelling of the Carolingian legend in the tradition of the earlier French epics. The political overtones it had in the first decade of the fourteenth century are not readily perceived by the modern reader to whom Girart's epic appears, upon cursive examination, to be merely another of the secondary epics. Still, we may be certain that these implications did not escape the contemporary reader.

Bowdoin College

GERARD J. BRAULT

### *Inferno*, I, 106-108

The expression "quell' umile Italia" in line 106 seems to have puzzled the commentators. I should like to suggest an interpretation of the word "umile" which is unlike any that I have yet seen.

The tercet goes as follows:

Di quell' umile Italia fia salute,  
per cui morì la vergine Camilla,  
Eurialo, e Turno, e Niso di ferute.

It seems pretty well agreed that Dante meant his readers to be reminded of *Aeneid*, III, 521-524 and of the wars in Italy described in the later books of the *Aeneid*. In Book III the Trojans under Aeneas had just left the Trojan settlement on the west coast of Greece ruled by Helenus, who had married Andromache, the widow of Hector.

<sup>10</sup> Folz, p. 387. The whole problem of "The Translation of the Empire" is treated in a special study by Folz, *L'Idée d'empire en occident du V<sup>e</sup> au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1953).

Helenus had given them favorable prophecies before they set sail for Italy. Their first sight of the promised land came in the early light of dawn.

Iamque rubescebat stellis Aurora fugatis  
cum procul obscuros colles humilemque videmus  
Italiam. Italiam primus conclamat Achates,  
Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant.

If they saw the land from a distance (*procul*, line 522), *humilem* is presumably to be translated as "lying low on the horizon." In line 522 "the hills and Italy" should be taken as a hendiadys and rendered "the hills of Italy."

I should translate the passage as follows: "And a brilliant dawn had just put the stars to flight when from afar we saw the dim hills of Italy lying low on the horizon. Achates was the first to cry "Italy!," and his companions raised a joyous shout of greeting, "Italy!"

Why should Dante have used the difficult word "umile" if not to call up this passage to run concurrently with his own words? It is a passage in which the Trojans caught the first sight of the promised land for which they had longed so ardently. But only a sight of it; many difficulties lay in their way before they should possess it.

But then why should he mention "Cammilla, Eurialo, e Turno, e Niso"—two of them Trojans, to be sure, but the other two Italians, and all four of them victims of the war in Italy described in the later books of the *Aeneid*?

I should like to suggest that the point of the whole tercet is to reinforce the idea that a new Italy may yet be achieved, the idea just stated in lines 99-105. With the word "umile" and its evocation of Vergil's lines the poet suggests two ideas: one, that Italy was the promised land where a great empire, the Roman Empire, should come into being; the other, the idea of a glimpse of the fulfillment of a promise which must be made a reality by faith, toil, and bloodshed. In the following two lines he refers to the fact that Vergil's new Italy was the creation of two originally opposed peoples, the Trojans and the former inhabitants. To reinforce this idea he even mixes Trojans and Italians, for he presumably could have left the inseparable Euryalus and Nisus together and have written, "Eurialo, e Niso, e Turno di ferute" instead of "Eurialo, e Turno, e Niso di ferute."

By "quell' umile Italia," then, Dante means "that Italy which lies low on the horizon"; a temporal rather than a geographical horizon. It is the Italy of his political hopes, as it was the Italy of the Roman

Empire which the Trojans were to found. But the fulfillment of the hope requires time and further struggle, as it did with the Trojans. The evocation of the lines of the *Aeneid* also suggests Vergil's repetition—Italy, "Italy! Italy!"—a cry which Dante himself might have uttered. And lines 107-108 suggest that the new state of things is to be the joint creation of peoples who had formerly fought each other.

The political vision of Dante, like that of Vergil, was broad. This interpretation of this passage would make the passage fit into Dante's political thought. The passage of Vergil evoked by the word "umile" also fits into Dante's thought. Like Vergil, he thought of an Italy which was more than a nation. Vergil's imagination had foreseen the greatest days of the Empire, which were to come after his time. It was to be an Empire that would give the world peace and security, with the carefully built structure of Roman Italy as its unshakeable core.

If in one way the Roman Empire of Dante's day was not based on Italy, in another way it still was. Dante's Empire, like Vergil's, was to secure order for the world through an inspiration and an authority which radiated outward from Italy. All this, likewise, was to come in the future, with a struggle, and by the efforts of mixed peoples.

University College, New York University

RICHARD M. HAYWOOD

## On *La Entretenida* of Cervantes

*La entretenida* is not one of Cervantes' most felicitous attempts at playwriting. Qualitatively it would probably fall halfway between the tragic grandeur of *La Numancia* and the thematic confusion of *La casa de los celos*. In its formal aspect, however, it is quite interesting since, among other peculiarities, the author introduces no less than six sonnets, including one in double *cabo roto*.<sup>1</sup> This is quite a surprising figure when we compare it with his other plays: two sonnets in *La casa de los celos*, one each in *La gran sultana* and

<sup>1</sup> "Que de un laca—la fuerza podero—," in *Comedias y entremeses*, ed. R. Schevill and A. Bonilla, III (Madrid, 1918), 68. On the *cabo roto*, for which Cervantes showed some weakness (see also the preliminaries to the *Quijote* of 1605), cf. F. Rodríguez Marín, *El Loaysa de "El celoso extremeño."* *Estudio histórico-literario* (Sevilla, 1901), pp. 166-168.

*El laberinto de amor*, none in the other six comedias. Among Cervantes' contemporaries this still remains a highly unusual number of sonnets. Only two plays have come to my attention with figures to match it: the anonymous *Caballero de Olmedo* (before 1607), with five, and *Los caballeros nuevos y carboneros de Tracia* (1608), attributed to Mira de Amescua, with seven.<sup>2</sup> Even for Lope de Vega, admittedly the pace setter in these matters, this high percentage is not too common.<sup>3</sup> It becomes evident by this survey, however, that this accumulation of sonnets could only have been interpreted as a formal characteristic of Lope's theater, at least during the lifetime of Cervantes. This fact, I believe, explains their strange abundance in *La entretenida*.

This play was written as a willful imitation of Lope's dramas, an imitation, however, that seeks for the effect of parody.<sup>4</sup> It is a well-known fact that the thought of his defeat in the theater at the hands of Lope always rankled Cervantes. This intention to parody is achieved, in part, by a deformation in the outline of the constituent elements of the model, with a grotesque exaggeration of its more salient formal characteristics. Therefore, Cervantes introduces six sonnets, and the deformation sought by the author is apparent in some of them. One ("Pluguiera a Dios que nunca aquí viniera," Act II) is recited in spurts by the *criado* Torrente, who is interrupted four times while doing so. Another is the one already mentioned in double *cabo roto*, where the conscious tampering with the form reaches its highest point. The other sonnets are more serious in nature and

<sup>2</sup> See the excellent article by the late Courtney Bruerton. "La versificación dramática española en el período 1587-1610," *NRFH*, x (1956), 337-364.

<sup>3</sup> The plays with six or more sonnets are the following: *Los comendadores de Córdoba* (before Sept. 1598), eight; *El galán escarmentado* (before Sept. 1598), eight; *Los muertos vivos* (1599-1602), six; *Angélica en el Catay* (1599-1603), seven; *La viuda valenciana* (before 1604), six; *La fortuna merecida* (1604-1615, probably 1604-1610), six; *El amigo hasta la muerte* (1606-1612, probably 1610-1612), seven; *El perro del hortelano* (1613-1615), nine; *El capellán de la Virgen* (1613-1616, probably 1615), seven; *El príncipe perfecto II* (1612-1618, probably 1616), six; *Nadie se conoce* (1615-1621, probably ca. 1618), six; *La cortesía de España* (1608-1612, retouched in 1618-1619?), six; *La discreta venganza* (1615-1622, probably 1620-1622), six; *Lo cierto por lo dudoso* (1612-1624, probably 1620-1624), seven. The dates are from Morley-Bruerton, *The Chronology of Lope de Vega's Comedias* (New York, 1940).

<sup>4</sup> For the cause-effect relationship between Lope's practice of the *comedia* and *La entretenida*, see Armando Cotarelo Valledor, *El teatro de Cervantes* (Madrid, 1915), pp. 431-460; Américo Castro, *El pensamiento de Cervantes* (Madrid, 1925), pp. 50-52. Joaquín Casaldueiro, *Sentido y forma del teatro de Cervantes* (Madrid, 1951), pp. 164-173, mentions the parody but not the model.

presentation, but their accumulation is still provoked by the intention to parody.

One of the sonnets in question is recited by don Antonio as a monologue, lamenting the absence of his beloved Marcela, who actually has been locked up by her father. It follows:<sup>5</sup>

¡Ay dura, ay importuna, ay triste ausencia!  
¡Cuán lexos devió estar de conocerte  
el que al furor de la inuencible muerte  
yguoló tu poder y tu violencia!

Que, quando con mayor rigor sentencia,  
¿qué puede más su limitada suerte,  
que deshazer la liga y nudo fuerte  
que a cuerpo y alma tiene inconueniencia?

Tu duro alfange a mayor mal se estiende,  
pues vn espíritu en dos mitades parte.  
¡O milagros de amor, que nadie entiende!

Que, del lugar de do mi alma parte,  
dexando su mitad con quien la enciende,  
consigo trayga la más frágil parte.

It is a rather infelicitous poem. The central idea is as old as lyric poetry itself: absence of or from the beloved equals death. But there is a definite lack of cohesion (*peccatum maximum* in these endeavors) and a few unskillful figures. Furthermore, the autorhyme of the tercets (*parte* used three times) would not have been acceptable even for a Golden Age rhetorician.<sup>6</sup>

The reason for some, by no means all, of these defects is that Cervantes has tried to compress within a sonnet ideas previously expressed by himself in a more flowing metrical form. In his pastoral novel *La Galatea* (1585) he inserts a long *égloga* in various meters and sung by different shepherds. When it is Crisio's turn to sing, he starts out with the following *octavas reales*:<sup>7</sup>

¡Ay dura, ay importuna, ay triste ausencia!  
¡Cuán fuera deuio estar de conocerte  
el que yguoló tu fuerça y violencia  
al poder inuencible de la muerte!  
Que, quando con mayor rigor sentencia,  
¿qué puede más su limitada suerte,

<sup>5</sup> Ed. cit., p. 24.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. J. H. Arjona, "The Use of Autorhymes in the XVIIth Century *Comedia*," *HR*, XXI (1953), 273-301.

<sup>7</sup> Ed. Schevill-Bonilla, I (Madrid, 1914), 206.

que deshazer el nudo y rezia liga  
que a cuerpo y alma estrechamente liga?

Tu duro alfanje a mayor mal se estiende,  
pues vn espiritu en dos mitades parte.  
;O milagros de amor que nadie entiende,  
ni se alcançan por sciencia ni por arte!  
;Que dexe su mitad con quien la enciende  
allá mi alma, y trayga acá la parte  
más frágil, con la qual más mal se siente  
que estar mil vezes de la vida ausente!

Cervantes has poured the poetic idea into a different mould. The opening comparison between death and absence is adroitly brought to an end; the poet would choose death a thousand times over ("estar mil veces de la vida ausente"), rather than face absence from his beloved. The "*furor de la invencible muerte*" of the sonnet, quite obscure since the subject is not violent death, is more properly—even if more prosaically—expressed in the *octavas* as the "poder invencible de la muerte."

This rehandling of poetic material written previously for a different purpose, is not rare in Cervantes. For example, the two sonnets that he wrote for *La casa de los celos* ("En el silencio de la noche, cuando," and "O le falta al amor conocimiento," both in Act III) appear respectively, with slight variants, in *Quijote*, I, chapters XXXIV and XXIII. We could explain this fact away as one more example of the widely publicized lack of poetic ability in Cervantes, leading him to return to his old material rather than laboriously try to give new expression to the same poetic idea.<sup>8</sup> But these occurrences might possibly have a different significance. This return to his previously formulated material is a characteristic trait of Cervantes' practice of the novel. Identity of circumstances and diversity of artistic and ideological treatments is a formula that covers a large zone of Cervantine art,<sup>9</sup> and could throw light both on the sonnets of *La entretenida* and those in the *Quijote*.

The Ohio State University

JUAN BAUTISTA AVALLE-ARCE

<sup>8</sup>The quotation that usually follows to back up such a statement is by Cervantes himself: "Yo, que siempre trabajo y me desvelo / por parecer que tengo de poeta / la gracia que no quiso darme el cielo," *Viaje del Parnaso*, chapter I.

<sup>9</sup>I have discussed the problem in more detail in "Una tradición literaria: el cuento de los dos amigos," *NRFH*, XI (1957), 1-35, and in "Conocimiento y vida en Cervantes," to be published this year in Buenos Aires.

## Artifice and Sincerity in the Poetry of Tristan l'Hermite<sup>1</sup>

In recent years many have shown new interest in the baroque or preclassical French poets, among them Tristan l'Hermite. Fervent admirers praise the ingenuity or harmoniousness of his lyricism. Detractors condemn his society verse for its preciousness and artificiality. He has given rise to two distinct problems in the realm of literary sincerity. One of these, which need be mentioned only briefly, is the question of his religious and philosophical views. In the 1620's and 1630's Tristan was known as a libertine, perhaps even an atheist, and he had close contacts with such men as Théophile de Viau and Cyrano de Bergerac. Yet he wrote nothing daring or dangerous, did his best to cultivate patrons in the aristocracy, and devoted his lyric talents to the genres which were fashionable in literary salons. In 1646 he even published a volume of religious verse, *L'Office de la Sainte Vierge*, whether as the result of a sincere conversion or, as one critic has suggested, as a hypocritical effort to gain respectability. In 1955, on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of Tristan's death, René Lacôte made the unjust comment that the poet never voiced his thoughts openly or sincerely; he even described Tristan's poetical works as "cette œuvre qui est pure et insincère façade."<sup>2</sup> For our part, rather than denounce an author for the views which he failed to express, it might be better to examine those which he did.

Here, also, there is a problem of literary sincerity. The title of this essay does not aim to pose a paradox. The word "artifice," in its best and broadest sense, denotes skillfully executed workmanship, the technical resourcefulness which enters into any work of art. It does not deny the possibility of sincerity; indeed it may contribute to the truth and genuineness with which an artist reveals his personality. Thus "artifice" and "sincerity" do not stand at opposite poles. Yet obviously the two concepts are quite different. As it happens they point to two tendencies which are very prominent in the works of Tristan l'Hermite: on the one hand a fondness for ingenious literary devices which makes his style artificial and precious, on the other hand an expression of strong emotion which seems to spring directly

<sup>1</sup> This article, slightly abridged, was read as a paper at the 1957 meeting of the Modern Language Association.

<sup>2</sup> "Tristan l'Hermite et sa façade poétique," *Les Lettres Françaises*, no. 584 (8-14 September, 1955).

from his heart. These trends may exist separately in various poems—certain ones being quite contrived and others quite natural—or they may be combined subtly and effectively in a single work.

One of the best approaches to Tristan is to read *Le Page disgracié*. It is a good realistic novel, one of the best of the early seventeenth century. Also, it is more or less autobiographical, telling the story of the author's boyhood and youth. Again, the question of sincerity: among the events in the novel, some of them highly implausible, which ones are fictitious? At times Tristan seems to have departed widely from the facts of his life, perhaps carried away by his imagination, or even indulging a taste for mystification. But the portrait of the page-boy emerges in true colors. Born around 1601 in a poor but noble family, he became a sort of vagabond and lived by his wits. He was proud, unruly, attractive to women and often passionately in love, given to fits of melancholy, inclined to get into quarrels and fights, addicted to gambling, interested in alchemy and magic. He enjoyed good company but often sought out seclusion for reading and dreaming. Somehow he became well versed in classical and modern literature and he claimed to know 10,000 lines of verse by heart. Unfortunately, *Le Page disgracié* comes to a stop at the point when Tristan is about twenty years old. But the mercurial personality of the adolescent poet offers many aids in the understanding of Tristan's character and art as they would develop in later years.

Toward 1621 he found a post on the staff of Gaston d'Orléans, the King's brother, whom he served loyally, but with very little reward, for over twenty years. He was always poor and frequently he had to plead for help from other benefactors. He gained considerable prestige as a dramatist, particularly with the tragedy *Mariane*, in 1636, which for a while rivaled *Le Cid* in popularity. Around 1638 he suffered the first attack of the disease, tuberculosis probably, which plagued him all the rest of his life and finally caused his death in 1655. This illness may have transformed him. It presumably led to his conversion and his composition of a book of prayers and religious meditations. It undoubtedly contributed to the gravity, the sadness, and the bitterness apparent in many of his poems written in the 1640's.

It is misleading, however, to speak of Tristan's "early manner" and "late manner." The chronology of his poetic works would be exceedingly difficult to establish, except in instances where he alludes to specific persons or events. He had the habit of saving his manu-

scripts, perhaps for a rainy day when he would need them, with the result that the date of composition of a poem and its date of publication may differ by ten to fifteen years. If we omit various manuscripts and small pamphlets we may say that Tristan's lyrical productions were published in the years 1633 to 1648, filling five sizable volumes.<sup>3</sup>

The first of these volumes, entitled *Les Plaintes d'Acante et autres œuvres*, once more brings up the problem of sincerity. The principal poem, over five hundred lines long, is a pastoral lamentation in which Acante complains of his unrequited love for Silvie, a beautiful but disdainful shepherdess. For three centuries it was believed that this composition was necessarily inspired by Tristan's own passion for some unidentified woman. Then, in 1937, Mlle Eugénie Droz discovered and published a manuscript which proved that the poem was commissioned by a distinguished nobleman (the Prince of Sedan) to further his courtship of a cruel beauty, the Countess of Bergh.<sup>4</sup> Did Tristan simply sell his services coldly, or did he enter into the game with enough personal zest and emotion to be called more or less sincere? The poem is full of literary borrowings—from Ovid, D'Urfé, Marino—and in style it teems with all the devices of *préciosité*: paradoxes, antitheses, forced comparisons, superlatives, *concetti*, plays on words, and the like. Yet many a stanza is redeemed by its gracefulness of touch and warmth of tone. A recent critic, Emile Henriot, dwells on Tristan's sincerity in the *Plaintes d'Acante*: “. . . pour parler si délicatement de l'amour, il fallait bien qu'il eût aimé pour son propre compte. . . . C'est bien un amoureux qui parle.”<sup>5</sup>

Tristan's most famous poem, *Le Promenoir des deux amants*, appeared in the same collection with *Les Plaintes d'Acante*. Slightly reminiscent of certain pieces by Théophile de Viau, it is partly a description of a lovely secluded retreat, partly a hymn in adoration of a beautiful woman. It begins with the play of light and shadows and the reflections in a quiet pool of water:

<sup>3</sup> These are: *Les Plaintes d'Acante et autres œuvres*, 1633 (critical ed. by Jacques Madeleine, Paris, 1909); *Les Amours*, 1634 (ed. by Pierre Camo, Paris, 1925); *La Lyre*, 1641; *L'Office de la Sainte Vierge*, 1646 (prose and verse; partial ed. by Frédéric Lachèvre, Paris, 1941); and *Les Vers héroïques*, 1648.

<sup>4</sup> *Le Manuscrit des Plaintes d'Acante de Tristan l'Hermite*, “Chez l'auteur,” [1937].

<sup>5</sup> Preface to Amédée Carriat, *Tristan, ou l'éloge d'un poète* (Limoges: Rougerie, 1955). For bibliographical data see Carriat, *Bibliographie des œuvres de Tristan l'Hermite* (Limoges: Rougerie, 1955).

Auprès de cette grotte sombre,  
Où l'on respire un air si doux,  
L'onde lutte avec les cailloux  
Et la lumière avecque l'ombre.

Ces flots, lassés de l'exercice  
Qu'ils ont fait dessus ce gravier,  
Se reposent dans ce vivier  
Où mourut autrefois Narcisse.

C'est un des miroirs où le faune  
Vient voir si son teint cramoisi,  
Depuis que l'amour l'a saisi,  
Ne serait point devenu jaune.

L'ombre de cette fleur vermeille  
Et celle de ces joncs pendants  
Paraissent être là-dedans  
Les songes de l'eau qui sommeille.

Continuing in this same precious but very charming manner, Tristan notes different aspects of this paradise dedicated to love: the grass and flowers, the hushed woods and mountains, the shade from an ancient oak tree, the sad song of a nightingale, the tender notes of turtle doves, and the presence of nymphs and other divinities. Then the poet addresses his lady, Climène, and henceforth her beauty becomes intermingled with the beauties of nature. For example, speaking of a gentle Zephyr:

Sa bouche, d'odeurs toute pleine,  
A soufflé sur notre chemin,  
Mêlant un esprit de jasmin  
A l'ambre de ta douce haleine.

Climène's features are seen mirrored in the pool and, near the end, she offers her pleading lover a drink from her hands. The last few stanzas are often omitted when the poem is printed in anthologies because they display such extreme artificiality. To the ecstatic lover the water feels like fire, and he begs for kisses to put out the flames. Nothing could be more precious, yet the poem is undeniably a masterpiece. Its exquisite imagery, its graceful intimacy, its harmonious lines, its tones of passion, make it an ardent dream of love. Marcel Arland has said of Tristan that he is "sincère jusque dans la pointe, le jeu et même dans la convention."<sup>6</sup> And more recently, Amédée Carriat: "La tradition pétrarquiste . . . se trouve dépassé. . . . Il

<sup>6</sup> *Les Echanges* (Paris: Gallimard, 1946), p. 15.

est passionné plus que galant."<sup>7</sup> Or again, on Tristan's concession to the stylistic tastes of his era, he calls this the poet's secret: ". . . recourir à la périphrase et à la métaphore, au calembour et à l'antithèse, au concetto et à la pointe . . . et puis, brusquement, trouver l'intonation qui touche."<sup>8</sup>

The same judgments could be applied to many others of Tristan's love poems, particularly his sonnets. Some of his sonnets, which are usually built around a paradoxical or dramatic conflict of emotions, are extremely rich in their lyrical qualities and they deserve to be studied attentively. But it is more important, here, to mention two or three other poems which stand out because of their elaborate display of artificial devices. One of them is virtually unknown, having been discovered only two years ago. It is called "Les Forges d'Antoigné" and describes very vividly the activities in an iron foundry, with the fires and molten metal compared to the inferno in the poet's heart.<sup>9</sup> Far more famous is the ode, "La Mer," dedicated to Gaston d'Orléans, circulated privately in 1627, then carefully revised for publication in *Les Vers héroïques* (1648). Here again the poet seeks out a solitary place, a cliff overlooking the sea, and describes all the changing aspects of the view before him, at low tide and high, in calm weather and in storms, at different times of the day and night. Among the poem's twenty-five stanzas the following one is quite characteristic; it presents a description of the light from the setting sun as it sparkles on the waves:

Le Soleil à longs traits ardents  
Y donne encore de la grâce  
Et tâche à se mirer dedans  
Comme on ferait dans une glace;  
Mais les flots de vert émaillés,  
Qui semblent des jaspes taillés,  
S'entre-dérobent son visage,  
Et par de petits tremblements  
Font voir au lieu de son image  
Mille pointes de diamants.

And so the poem goes, with scene after scene in which precious

<sup>7</sup> Carriat, *Tristan*, p. 90.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 96.

<sup>9</sup> Text available in Carriat, *Tristan*, pp. 139-144, reproduced from a printed leaflet bound with a copy of *Les Vers héroïques* at the Bibliothèque Nationale. Carriat does not publish, however, a long "Avertissement" which accompanies the poem. In this interesting document Tristan discusses his artistic purposes and defends his imagery against charges of extravagance.

imagery is combined with keenly observed pictorial details. It is not deeply emotional but it fulfills admirably the purpose which Tristan announced in his opening lines, a kind of "rêverie," as he said, "Sur la majesté de la mer."

Another poem, much longer and even more ostentatious in conception, is "L'Orphée" (in *La Lyre*, 1641), recounting the tragic love story of Orpheus and Eurydice. Here Tristan takes delight in exhibiting his virtuosity. He enumerates over thirty species of trees which crowd around Orpheus when the musician plays his lyre. For example:

A ses premiers accords on voit soudain paraître  
Le noyer, le cormier, le tilleul et le hêtre;  
Le chêne, qui jadis couronnait le vainqueur  
D'une juste pitié s'y fendit jusqu'au cœur. . . .

But this is not all; he goes on to list some twenty types of birds and also a score of different animals. In spite of these exaggerated effects "L'Orphée" contains passages marked by deep feeling and dramatic eloquence, especially the long farewell speech by Eurydice to her lover, the one which begins:

"Adieu, charmant Orphée, adieu, ma chère vie,  
C'est enfin pour jamais que je te suis ravie.  
Par ce transport d'amour tout espoir m'est ôté  
De revoir du soleil l'agréable clarté.  
Ta curiosité trop peu considérée  
Me remet dans les fers dont tu m'avais tirée. . . ."

There are lines in "L'Orphée" which suggest the style of La Fontaine in his *Adonis* and the tragic tones of Racine.

Scholars who have followed the recent research on the baroque style in France will be struck by the baroque qualities of Tristan's verse. His ingenuity, his theatricality, his use of contrast and surprise, his fondness for movement and metamorphosis, his emphasis or exaggeration—all these elements in his art correspond to the categories of baroque aesthetics as studied in the excellent books by Jean Rousset and Imbrie Buffum.<sup>10</sup> But, unlike certain other poets of the era—Sponde, La Ceppède, perhaps Saint-Amant—Tristan cannot be classified as wholly baroque. Even his most artificial pieces are characterized by a certain delicacy of touch and a kind of emotional frank-

<sup>10</sup> Jean Rousset, *La Littérature de l'âge baroque en France* (Paris: José Corti, 1954); Imbrie Buffum, *Studies in the Baroque from Montaigne to Rotrou* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957).

ness. There is another side to him too: a large body of poetry which displays far less artifice and is above all serious and thoughtful.

This vein becomes richer in his later writings, after his illness and conversion, but there are traces of it even in his earliest works. In his first volume of verse, for example, the "Consolation à Idalie" is expressed with all the gravity and dignity which we associate with Malherbe. It is interesting to note that Tristan had great admiration for Malherbe and seems to have learned many lessons from him. He eulogizes him in "Les Misères humaines" (in *La Lyre*, 1641), a long and bitter meditative poem on the frustrations of love, the sorrows of life, and the inevitability of death. It was probably Malherbe, perhaps along with Horace and Virgil, both of whom are cited in the same poem, who gave Tristan his highest poetic aspirations. Horace was in his mind, undoubtedly, when he wrote his ode, "A M. de Chaudebonne" (also in *La Lyre*) describing in proud and melancholic tones the simple rustic pleasures which sometimes offered him consolation. The example of Virgil can be seen in some of his "vers héroïques," notably the ode "Au Maréchal de Schomberg," which recounts in lofty language the battle at Leucate in 1637.

Thus it is clear that Tristan was far more than a clever embroiderer of sentimental verse. It should be pointed out that he wrote numerous pieces expressing his revolt against the charms of women and his preference for emotional independence, even total solitude. One of these is rather well known, the "Plainte à la belle banquière" (in *Les Amours*, 1634), in which he chides a woman who has rejected him because of his poverty. He says, in part:

Abhorrant l'émotion  
Et la sale passion  
Des âmes intéressées,  
Je laisse courir mes sens  
Et promener mes pensées  
Sur des objets innocents.  
  
Le bien de sentir des fleurs  
De qui l'âme et les couleurs  
Charment mes esprits malades,  
Et l'eau qui d'un haut rocher  
Se va jetant par cascades,  
Sont mon trésor le plus cher.

Other such poems which might be cited are "L'Enchantement rompu" and "Le Cruel" (both in *Les Amours*). One of his very finest com-

positions, "La Servitude" (in *Les Vers héroïques*), is also a declaration of revolt, this time against his ungrateful protector, Gaston d'Orléans. It opens with a beautiful invocation to night—"Nuit fraîche, sombre et solitaire"—then goes on in later stanzas to a proud and bitter discussion of his problems, particularly his horror of being a slave in someone else's service:

L'image de la Servitude,  
Errant dans mon étude,  
Y promène l'horreur qui réside aux enfers;  
J'ai déjà qu'on m'enrôle au nombre des esclaves;  
Je ne vois plus que des entraves,  
Des jugs et des colliers, des chaînes et des fers.

Tristan's genuine suffering, both physical and moral, gives a dark color to much of his writing. Some of the themes which recur in his lyric verse, and also in various letters and prefaces, are his need for solitary contemplation, his failures as a courtier, remorse for his sins (in *L'Office de la Sainte Vierge*), his sickness which doctors could not help, the austerity of his life, his love of books and reading, his unrewarded devotion to art, and his awareness of approaching death. There are two sonnets to which he apparently gave particular attention and which sum up his life and thought. One of them stands at the end of the volume *Les Amours* and is entitled "Misère de l'homme du monde." It speaks sadly of the struggles and hypocrisy of the social world, of disappointments in love, of grief and old age, and finally makes this generalization:

C'est l'heureux sort de l'homme! O misérable sort!  
Tous ces attachements sont-ils considérables,  
Pour aimer tant la vie, et craindre tant la mort?

These antitheses may be precious, stylistically, but the mood of disillusionment seems unmistakably genuine.

The other sonnet, far more personal in tone, stands on the final page of *Les Vers héroïques* as a kind of epilogue to the poet's life. It begins with this striking vision of death:

C'est fait de mes destins; je commence à sentir  
Les inconvénients que la vieillesse apporte.  
Déjà la pâle Mort, pour me faire partir,  
D'un pied sec et tremblant vient frapper à ma porte.

—and it ends with an exhortation, addressed to himself, to renounce vain pleasures and make a virtuous preparation for his final rest:

Sortons de ces erreurs par un sage conseil,  
Et cessant d'embrasser les images d'un songe,  
Pensons à nous coucher pour le dernier sommeil.

In these poems, and in many others too, Tristan reveals a style that is more elevated than precious and a way of thought that is ardent and reflective rather than simply ingenious. Artifice and sincerity, happily combined, give his verse a special quality which sets him apart from other writers of his age. His resourcefulness in style and imagery, his metrical skill, his purity of diction, his depth of feeling, sounded a new note in French poetry and contributed greatly to the flowering of the classical period.

University of Illinois

PHILIP A. WADSWORTH

### Pastor Bertrand and Voltaire's *Lisbonne*

On December 16, 1755, Voltaire was at his winter quarters at Monrion (near Lausanne) and from there wrote to his publishers, the Cramer brothers, at Geneva. The letter runs in part:<sup>1</sup>

Vous êtes, Messieurs, trop bons chrétiens et vous avez malheureusement trop de part à l'aventure de Lisbonne pour n'avoir pas imprimé au plus vite le sermon qui désarmera la vengeance divine, et après lequel il n'y aura jamais de tremblement de terre. Je me flatte que vous aurez eu la bonté d'envoyer les premiers exemplaires au prédicateur; je vous prie de vouloir bien m'en donner avis, afin que je puisse me vanter à lui d'avoir coopéré à cette œuvre pieuse.

Recent scholars who have dealt with the *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne* have interpreted this letter directly or indirectly as meaning that Voltaire is obliquely referring to himself as the *prédicateur* and to his poem as the *sermon*. Morize in the introduction to *Candide*<sup>2</sup> says: "Dès le 16 décembre 1755 le *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne* est imprimé." Among his footnotes, which are inaccurate here, one refers to our letter. He thus uses this letter as proof that Voltaire is referring to himself and to his poem. Ascoli in his *Cours de Sorbonne* lectures, entitled *Voltaire—Poèmes philosophiques* (p. 183) claims:

<sup>1</sup> *Œuvres complètes de Voltaire*, Moland ed., xxxviii, 522.

<sup>2</sup> Paris, 1931, p. xli.

Une lettre de Voltaire, aux frères Cramer, écrite de Monrion, près Lausanne, le 16 décembre 1755 révèle qu'à cette date le poème était écrit depuis quelques jours, qu'il avait été remis aux frères Cramer pour être imprimé et que Voltaire se préoccupait d'en recevoir des exemplaires. La lettre prouve qu'il craignait les indiscretions et qu'il souhaitait, si sa lettre tombait sous des yeux indiscrets, que sa paternité du poème n'y fût pas clairement reconnue. . . .

Professor Havens, in "Twelve New Letters of Voltaire to Gabriel Cramer,"<sup>3</sup> agrees with Ascoli that the letter in question refers to the Lisbon poem, but publishes a letter dated December 4 (1755) which he claims deals with the same work and thus takes from the letter of December 16 its previous distinction of being the first to deal with the poem. It is worded:

On me presse extrêmement, Monsieur, pour l'œuvre du Seigneur. J'ai la fièvre et je ne veux point mourir sans avoir satisfait mon zèle. Prenez cela, si vous voulez, pour un transport au cerveau; mais je vous demande en grâce de vouloir bien me dire si vous avez donné à un imprimeur l'oraison funèbre de Lisbonne, et encor à quel imprimeur. Si vous n'en avez point trouvé, ayez la bonté de me renvoyer le sermon; je trouverai pratique sur le champ. Pardonnez-moi mes saintes importunités.

Le malade vous embrasse sans cérémonie.

#### V.

The present editor of Voltaire's correspondence, Mr. Theodore Besterman, while cautiously side-stepping the question of the letter of December 16 with no commentary as to its meaning, does stress his agreement with Professor Havens in regard to the letter of December 4. His commentary thereon reads:<sup>4</sup> "The date of this letter is of interest in fixing the date of composition of the 'œuvre du Seigneur,' the 'oraison funèbre,' the 'sermon,' that is, the *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne*." In the most recent study,<sup>5</sup> *The Search for a New Voltaire*, Professor Wade grants the plausibility of Ascoli's interpretation of "this letter . . . crucial in determining the date of composition for *Lisbonne*." Nonetheless he later describes it as "the puzzling letter," which he attempts to clarify, somewhat gratuitously, by reference to a work—*Vers sur le renversement de Lisbonne*—of unknown authorship.

It seems to the present writer that these interpretations of the "puzzling letter" or letters are wide of the mark, and that a different

<sup>3</sup> *RR*, XXXI (1940), 342-43.

<sup>4</sup> *Voltaire's Correspondence*, XXVIII (1957), 177 n.

<sup>5</sup> In the *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New Series (Philadelphia, 1958), XLVIII (part 4), 45.

tack is needed. There was in Voltaire's circle of friends at this time one Jean-Elie Bertrand, "premier pasteur" of the French Church at Bern, with whom he maintained an active correspondence. Born at Orbe in 1713, he served as a tutor in private families in Geneva, and in Holland as well, where he sojourned from 1735 to 1738. On his return to his homeland he studied for the ministry, and the laying-on of hands took place in March 1740. Nothing succeeds like success; his star rose rapidly in the fifties and sixties as the data on the less-than-modest title page of one of his works will attest: "Secrétaire de la Société économique [of Bern], maintenant conseiller de la cour du roi de Pologne; des académies de Berlin, de Goettingue, de Suède, de Florence, de Leipsic, de Mayenne, de Munich, de Lyon, de Nancy, de Bâle; des sociétés d'Agriculture de Paris, de Lyon, de Rouen, de Dublin etc." He had been received into the Berlin Academy as a *confrère* of Voltaire on June 29, 1752, presumably on the strength of his labors in the field of natural history. He was to be a contributor to the *Mercure Suisse*, to the *Journal Helvétique*, and to the *Encyclopédie*.<sup>6</sup> When he became acquainted with the French poet is not clear from the record, but he seems to have sent him a copy of his *Essais sur les usages des montagnes* (1754). Voltaire used his good offices in *pourparlers* with a view to acquiring winter quarters at Lausanne (January 1755). He was a visitor to Les Délices in July. The correspondence throughout that year reveals the mutually cordial relations existing between them, and the poet writes him: "Vous faites une de mes plus grandes consolations" (September 30, 1755).<sup>7</sup>

Voltaire had been appealing for his aid and counsel during the quarrel with Grasset over the publication of *La Pucelle*, "beaucoup plus impie que *l'Épître à Uranie*."<sup>8</sup> It was in the course of this correspondence that the poet mentioned in a letter, dated November 28, the "triste confirmation du désastre de Lisbonne et de vingt autres villes," followed two days later by another expressing his horror at the news. The pastor too was impressed by the news and his interest was expressed over the years in four sermons on the subject and in various treatises dealing with earthquakes. The first sermon was

<sup>6</sup> See Roger de Guimps, *Elie Bertrand d'Yverdon* (Yverdon, 1855), and Paul Dumont, "Jean-Elie Bertrand (1713-1797), quelques pages de l'histoire des idées philosophiques théologiques et morales dans la Suisse française à la fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* (Lausanne, 1905). See also *passim* L. E. Roulet, *Voltaire et les Bernois*, Neuchâtel [1950].

<sup>7</sup> The Besterman ed. (xxvii, 269) lists a nonexistent Bertrand letter.

<sup>8</sup> Moland, xxxviii, 499.

preached in his church at Bern on November 30, 1755. It chose its text from the Book of the prophet Jeremiah (XXII: 8).<sup>9</sup> We may assume that, proud of his success in his sermon, he sent it to Voltaire with the request that he be kind enough to arrange for its printing by the Cramers. Voltaire agreed. On December 4 he wrote to Gabriel Cramer urging haste upon him in arranging for the printing of Bertrand's sermon and stating that he was under some pressure to bring the matter to a successful issue. A printer was found and the arrangements were made. The poet left towards the middle of the month for Monrion. From there he wrote again on December 16 to inquire how the matter was proceeding and whether copies had been sent to Bertrand so that he could take some credit for his share in the undertaking. On December 26 he wrote again to the Cramers as follows, referring apparently this time to the Vevey edition of Bertrand's work: "On vient de me dire que tous les exemplaires du sermon de Mr. Bertrand ont été enlevés en un moment à Lausanne." Thus the business venture in which he had played a role was having gratifying success and Bertrand's friendship could only be cemented thereby.

It seems clear to the writer that this explanation, despite the lack of conclusive evidence, clarifies the puzzling letters of December 4 and December 16, that the *prédicateur* is Bertrand, and that the *œuvre du Seigneur* and the *sermon* are the sermon he preached in his church at Bern on November 30, 1755. These letters then do not furnish any evidence whatever as to the composition of the *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne*, a subject I shall discuss in a forthcoming article.

University of California, Los Angeles

FRANCIS J. CROWLEY

## A New Date for *Jacques le fataliste*

When Rosenkranz<sup>1</sup> and Assézat<sup>2</sup> assigned a date to *Jacques le fataliste*, they had only two pieces of evidence upon which to draw. The first was a passage from Mme de Vandeuil's *Mémoires* in which

<sup>9</sup> See Formey's *Nouvelle Bibliothèque Germanique*, XIX, 51. Formey praises (*ibid.*, XVIII, 450) "les talents solides et les vues louables" of Bertrand. Formey was in correspondence with him.

<sup>1</sup> Karl Rosenkranz, *Diderots Leben und Werke* (Leipzig, 1866), II, 316.

<sup>2</sup> Jules Assézat et Maurice Tourneux eds., *Œuvres complètes de Diderot* (Paris, 1875-1877), VI, 8.

she said of Diderot that, "depuis son retour [from Russia, in 1774] il s'est occupé de divers petits ouvrages qu'il n'a point imprimés. Il s'est amusé à la Haye à réfuter l'ouvrage d'Helvétius. Il fit deux petits romans, *Jacques le fataliste*, *la Religieuse*, et quelques petits contes; mais ce qui ruina, détruisit le reste de ses forces, fut l'*Essai sur les règnes de Claude et de Néron*, et une besogne dont il fut chargé par un de ses amis."<sup>3</sup> The second was a reference in the text of *Jacques* itself to Goldoni's *Le Bourru bienfaisant*, first performed in Paris on November 4, 1771. Rosenkranz dismissed Mme de Vandeuil's testimony because she grouped *Jacques* together with *La Religieuse*, and he knew that Diderot had been working on *La Religieuse* as early as 1760. He concentrated instead on the passage in which Diderot makes suggestions for improving Goldoni's play, and, on the basis of that alone, concluded that Diderot probably wrote *Jacques* in 1772.

Assézat took Mme de Vandeuil's *Mémoires* more seriously and put forth the possibility that what she had in fact observed was Diderot in the process of revising rather than of beginning both *Jacques* and *La Religieuse*: "Nous avons vu qu'il n'avait fait que retoucher ce dernier. Peut-être aussi n'a-t-il fait, dans le premier, que donner un cadre à des histoires depuis longtemps ébauchées et que le procédé de Sterne lui permettait de rattacher par un lien commun." Even as a source of information for dating the revisions, however, the passage from Mme de Vandeuil's *Mémoires* is not very reliable, telescoping, as it does, in a muddle of time sequences, a period extending from 1774 to Diderot's death. Moreover, once he had introduced the idea of revisions, Assézat thereby unwittingly precluded the possibility of attaining any certainty whatsoever regarding the inception of *Jacques*. *Le Bourru bienfaisant* has little place in his argument, and the *Mémoires* themselves, as far as he could see, gave no indication of when Diderot began working on his novel. In an unexplained, baffling conjectural leap, Assézat claimed that "c'est pendant son séjour en Hollande et en Russie que Diderot a écrit ce livre," and the date he proposed was 1773.

Oddly enough, that is the date the majority of critics have come to accept as most plausible.<sup>4</sup> André Babelon made it appear even more likely when he discovered two letters written by Diderot from

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., I, liv.

<sup>4</sup> A random choice: Guy Palmade ed., *Jacques le fataliste* (Paris, 1948), p. 7; André Billy ed., *Œuvres de Diderot* (Paris, 1951), p. 1442; Henri Bénac ed., *Œuvres romanesques de Diderot* (Paris, 1951), p. 493, n. 408; Lester Crocker, *The Embattled Philosopher* (Lansing, 1954), p. 401.

the Hague in 1773, one to Sophie Volland stating: "J'ai fait deux ou trois ouvrages assez gais,"<sup>5</sup> and the other to Mme d'Epinay: "Je me suis amusé à écrire une petite satire dont j'avais le projet lorsque je quittai Paris. Je vous fournirois, je crois, de quoi soutenir la *Correspondance* de Grimm pendant deux ou trois mois."<sup>6</sup> The letters unfortunately mention no work by name, and even more to the point, do not clearly indicate, if the work was *Jacques*, whether Diderot began it at that time or was then extending and revising it: Diderot may have eventually included in *Jacques* stories he had written separately. These letters, in other words, supplied little information that had not already been arrived at by conjecture.

Only recently has anyone thought to take issue with Assézat's 1773 date. Professor J. Robert Loy, in his *Diderot's Determined Fatalist*,<sup>7</sup> supposes that "the most probable date for *Jacques* is 1774 . . . ; the very good reasons for that date must . . . remain a conjecture." He details his reasons: "the general changing tone of the [Diderot] letters as one approaches 1774," the evolution of Diderot's thought from the "earlier and seemingly complete materialistic conception of the universe," his physical and spiritual exhaustion after completing the *Encyclopédie* and his journey to Russia, the long awaited opportunity to write in an attractive medium "that work on vice and virtue which he had always promised himself." But he concludes, confusedly and paradoxically: "This assumes, without any definite proof, that Diderot started *Jacques* in all probability before leaving for Russia, worked at it en route, and finished it after his return in 1774. And if the novel was written in 1774, it is possible to see in its very form, a reflection of the long trip to and from the court of Catherine." Professor Loy, understandably, was unable to make up his mind. M. Yvon Belaval too, in his "Quelques notes d'accompagnement" to the most recent (and limited) edition of *Jacques*,<sup>8</sup> dissents from the Assézat date; he, however, following Rosenkranz's example, backdates it to 1772. He adds to Rosenkranz's argument the fact that Holbach's

<sup>5</sup> *Lettres à Sophie Volland* (Paris, 1930), III, 244. Babelon, in a footnote, identified these works: "Sans doute *Le Neveu de Rameau* composé en 1762 et revu en 1773, puis *Jacques le fataliste et son maître* et le *Paradoxe sur le Comédien*, revu vers 1778."

<sup>6</sup> *Correspondance inédite* (Paris, 1931), I, 217. Babelon indicates that the "satyre" is *Le Neveu de Rameau*, but there has been some doubt about the identification. See, for example, J. Robert Loy, *Diderot's Determined Fatalist* (New York, 1950), p. 55, n. 4.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 54-58.

<sup>8</sup> (Paris: Le Club français du livre, 1953), p. 1.

*Système de la nature*, which he holds to be a primary influence on Diderot's novel, appeared in 1770 and that the "Mme de la Pommeraye" episode in *Jacques* is strikingly analogous to *Mme de la Carlière* (probably 1772). He believes that Diderot continued to work on his novel in Holland—witness the letter to Sophie Volland in 1773—"puis en Russie, peut-être aux dernières 80 pages (environ) qui semblent rédigées après coup et 'pour en finir'."

If this large body of conjecture does not provide a certain date for the inception of *Jacques*, it does reasonably suggest—and therein lies its genuine value and my reason for considering it here at length—a period of time during which Diderot was working at it: 1772, 1773, 1774, and, if we so interpret *Mme de Vandeul*, 1775. Concrete evidence does exist, however, for an initial date. On September 12, 1771, the father of Henri Meister wrote to his friend Bodmer about his son's activities in Paris where he was obviously in contact with Diderot: "Diderot n'a pas encore commencé son traité *De vita bona et beata*, mais il a fait un conte charmant, *Jacques le fataliste*. L'auteur en a lu à notre homme pendant deux heures."<sup>9</sup> What is immediately startling about this new 1771 date is that it precedes by at least two months what so many critics had taken to be the probable *terminus a quo*: November 4, 1771, the date of the first performance of *Le Bourru*. And this very fact opens up new areas for conjecture.

The reference to *Le Bourru* occurs about one-third of the way through the novel and is situated in the midst of that famous scene at the Inn where *Mme de Pommeraye's* story is told. Approximately twenty pages before the author's digression on *Le Bourru*, we are given a passing glance at the Marquis des Arcis, *Mme de la Pommeraye's* lover, and the tale the "hôtesse" is soon to tell about him is thereafter repeatedly adumbrated. Could Diderot have written the entire scene before 1772? The passage on Goldoni's play has a tone so urgent and appeals so directly to the reader who has just seen the play, that it would appear to be exactly contemporary with the performance. There is no longer any reason to assume that it was not, and the digression could only have been added—if it was an addition—after Diderot had launched the "Mme de la Pommeraye" episode. It can therefore no longer be stated, categorically, as it often has been, that *Mme de la Carlière* was written before "Mme de la Pommeraye." Indeed, the probability that the latter was the earlier written assumes in this instance a still larger

<sup>9</sup> *Lettres inédites de Mme de Staël à Henri Meister*, ed. Paul Usteri et Eugène Ritter (Paris, 1903), p. 24.

importance: the new 1771 date reveals *Jacques* to be the first and missing link in that chain of works whose pessimistic commentaries on man in society seem, in large part, to derive from Diderot's bitter experience with Mme de Meaux in the last months of 1770: *Mme de la Carlière* (1772), *Essai sur les femmes* (1772), *Supplément au voyage de Bougainville*, and *Ceci n'est pas un conte* (1772-1773).

Professor Herbert Dieckmann who, with great insight, has analyzed the logic and organic unity of all these works in the illuminating perspective of Diderot's "inner climate," was troubled by the lapse of two years before the influence of that crisis of 1770 became apparent in Diderot's works.<sup>10</sup> *Jacques*, begun in 1771, now stands as the first work to echo the multiple personal and philosophic overtones of the Meaux affaire: the concern with love, with incommunicability in human relationships, with the unexpected, often disillusioning turn of events, all of which are obvious even in the opening pages. Meister's letter adds one other new aspect to the total picture of the genesis of *Jacques*, and here Professor Loy must take credit for conjecturing what the letter firmly establishes: Diderot was planning a formal treatise on ethics<sup>11</sup> which he abandoned in favor of *Jacques*. To what extent he worked into the second his ideas for the first, and to what extent he undertook *Jacques* as a reaction to his labors at what he recognized to be, for him, the impossible task of formalizing his ethical thought in a conventional treatise is open to question, but there can be no doubt of Diderot's concern, in *Jacques*, with serious ethical issues. One cannot but be grateful after all that Diderot, always at his best in an open, dialectic form, wrote his "conte charmant" instead of the projected *De vita bona et beata*.

Rutgers University

JACK UNDANK

<sup>10</sup> Ed., *Supplément au voyage de Bougainville* (Genève, 1955). See "Introduction," especially pp. cxii-cxxxiii. The Meaux affaire, it need hardly be indicated, was only one of many influences that shaped Diderot's views during those years.

<sup>11</sup> Pierre Hermand noticed that one of Diderot's ambitions was to compose "une *Ethique*." *Les Idées morales de Diderot* (Paris, 1923), p. xi.

## Hildebrandslied 21a

Lines 20-22a of the *Hildebrandslied*

her furlaet in lante    luttilla sitten  
prut in bure    barn unwahsan,  
arbeo laosa:

have been subject to various interpretations.<sup>1</sup> One, following Lachmann, gives possibly the readiest translation at first glance; as an example of it we may cite Baesecke's translation, *das Hildebrandlied* 11 (Halle, 1944): "Er verließ im Lande die (Lützele) Kleine sitzen, die (Braut) Frau im (Bauer) Hause, das Kind unerwachsen, erbelos." Another, following a suggestion of Pütz, is based on a stricter analysis of *luttilla*, for with its *-a* rather than *-un*, it should not modify the feminine *prut*; *prut* is then interpreted as a genitive singular, and the passage is translated as did J. Sverdrup in *Festschrift Eugen Mogk* 113 (Halle, 1924): "Er ließ im Lande das Kleine, das unerwachsene Kind erbelos im Frauengemach sitzen." There is however no indication in the manuscript that *prut* is a miscopied form of a genitive *pruti*; we should also expect an *a*-ending on the adjective *unwahsan* if it is parallel with *luttilla* and *laosa*. By another interpretation *luttilla* and *laosa* are analyzed as accusative plural neuters, and the mother and child taken as a pair which would require neuter modifiers. There is however no syntactic connection between *prut* and *barn*. Since these various interpretations have not been wholly satisfactory, I suggest that the problem may lie in a part of the lines that has not hitherto been dealt with, in the phrase *in bure*.

What little discussion there has been of the phrase *in bure* was occasioned primarily by Koegel's observation, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* 1.1.217 (Strassburg, 1894), that the most likely meaning here, "bower, women's quarters," was not to be found in the High German dialects. Since however we consider the *Hildebrandslied* a part of the Germanic poetic tradition, with an epic vocabulary different from that of materials composed in High German, the presence of a hapax legomenon does not surprise us in the absence of further epic poetry among the High German materials.

<sup>1</sup> Since there are complete bibliographies of previous work on the *Hildebrandslied* in various readily accessible publications, notably W. Braune, *Althochdeutsches Lesebuch* in its various editions, whose versions I cite, it seems wasteful of space to list all the places in which these lines have been discussed; I shall also keep my argumentation to a minimum.

If instead of occupying ourselves first with the apparent meaning of the passage we made a strict syntactic analysis, we would assume as object of *furlaet* nouns which require adjectives with *a*-endings, as we find them preceding and following line 21; like Koegel, *Gesch.* 1.1.216, who pointed to a similar form in the first *Merseburger Zauberspruch* and other OHG materials, I analyze *lutila* and *laosa* as neuter plurals. On the other hand line 21 contains an adjective, *unwahan*, which with no ending must modify *barn* alone. We might then assume that the two nouns which require *a*-endings on *lutila* and *laosa* are *prut* and *barn*, but we should then expect a coordinate conjunction linking them. Accordingly I suggest that the nouns are *prut* and *bure*; that *bure* is a cognate of Gothic *baur* "child"; that *in* is the short form of *inti* found in materials written at Fulda, notably the archaic scribe  $\gamma$  of the *Tatian*; and that *barn unwahan* is a variation of *bure* alone. By this interpretation there would be no syntactic difficulties in the analysis of *lutila*, *laosa* and *unwahan*; and the phrase structure of the lines would be relatively simple.

We may justify our interpretation of *bure* as a cognate of Gothic *baur* by noting its frequency of usage in Germanic heroic poetry and its occurrence as an element of Langobardic names. In the *Beowulf*, *byre* is attested six times with the meaning "son," once with the meaning "youth." In the *Edda*, *burr* is attested twenty-three times with the meaning "son." In the small body of Langobardic names we find several built up on a form of *bure*; W. Bruckner, *Die Sprache der Langobarden* (Strassburg, 1895) cites *Ühtbora*, 79, *Borno* and *Porelbertus*, 238. If with Baesecke, *Hildebrandslied* 55-61, we assume that the *Hildebrandslied* was a Langobardic poem, brought north to Bavaria and then Fulda, we might well expect *bure* "son" to be a part of its vocabulary. We could also readily account for its final *-e* in an *i*-stem, for according to Bruckner 77, in Langobardic materials dating from the eighth century, *-e* is commonly written for *-i*.

I suggest then that *prut* and *bure* are the objects of *furlaet*, with the variation *arbeo laosa*; *barn unwahan* is in turn a variation of *bure* alone, and should be preceded by a comma. A translation of lines 20-22a would read: "He left in the land the wretched ones remaining behind, his wife and his son, a small boy, deprived of their inheritance."

The University of Texas

W. P. LEHMANN

## A New Solution to the "Nacht. Offen Feld" Scene of Goethe's *Faust*

What are the shadowy beings glimpsed fleetingly by Faust and Mephistopheles in the tantalizingly brief, ambiguous scene "Nacht. Offen Feld"?

Faust, Mephistopheles, auf schwarzen  
Pferden daherbrausend.

Faust. Was weben die dort um den Rabenstein?

Meph. Weiss nicht, was sie kochen und schaffen.

Faust. Schweben auf, schweben ab, neigen sich, beugen sich.

Meph. Eine Hexenzunft.

Faust. Sie streuen und weihen.

Meph. Vorbei! Vorbei! <sup>1</sup>

Since Eckermann's oft-cited conversation of November 29, 1826, in which Goethe expressed his delight at Delacroix' illustration of the scene depicting "Gespenster unter dem Galgen" and Faust's "furchtsam fragendes Gesicht," most commentators (Düntzer,<sup>2</sup> Fischer,<sup>3</sup> Traumann,<sup>4</sup> Petsch,<sup>5</sup> Schröer,<sup>6</sup> Witkowski,<sup>7</sup> Friedrich,<sup>8</sup> Endres,<sup>9</sup> and Fuerst<sup>10</sup>) have preferred to regard the creatures hovering over the execution place as witches, ghosts, or demons. Minor<sup>11</sup> and Vischer<sup>12</sup> admit the possibility of good spirits but think bad ones more probable. Beutler<sup>13</sup> and Heffner, Rehder and Twaddell<sup>14</sup> remain neutral on the subject. Loeper<sup>15</sup> and Trendelenburg,<sup>16</sup> because of the apparent parallel with Bürger's "Lenore," consider the creatures to be ghosts

<sup>1</sup> *Faust*, lines 4399-4404.

<sup>2</sup> H. Düntzer, *Goethes Faust*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1857), I, 377.

<sup>3</sup> Kuno Fischer, *Goethes Faust* (1913), III, 351.

<sup>4</sup> Ernst Traumann, *Goethes Faust nach Entstehung und Inhalt erklärt* (Munich, 1913), I, 434-436.

<sup>5</sup> *Goethes Faust*, ed. Robert Petsch (Leipzig, 1924). Krogmann (see Note 23) mentions him as one who thinks the beings are demons rather than angels.

<sup>6</sup> *Faust*, ed. K. J. Schröer (Leipzig, 1925), I, 296-297.

<sup>7</sup> *Faust*, ed. G. Witkowski (Leiden, 1936), II, 284-285.

<sup>8</sup> Th. Friedrich, *Goethes Faust*, 3rd ed. (1939), p. 201.

<sup>9</sup> *Faust*, ed. F. C. Endres (Basel, 1949), I, 286.

<sup>10</sup> Norbert Fuerst, "Die phantasmagorischen Gestalten des Faust," *Monatsh. XLII* (1949), 277-289.

<sup>11</sup> J. Minor, *Goethes Faust* (Stuttgart, 1901), I, 226-228.

<sup>12</sup> F. Th. Vischer, *Goethes Faust* (1921), pp. 210 f.

<sup>13</sup> *Faust und Urfaust*, ed. Ernst Beutler, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1940), p. 572, Note to 4399-4404.

<sup>14</sup> *Faust*, ed. R-M. S. Heffner, H. Rehder, W. F. Twaddell (Boston, 1954), I, 418.

<sup>15</sup> *Faust*, ed. G. v. Loeper (1879), I, 198.

<sup>16</sup> A. Trendelenburg, *Goethes Faust* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1922), I, 470-471.

of persons previously executed on the site. Buchwald<sup>17</sup> thinks they are a hallucination projected by Faust's anxiety. Baumgart,<sup>18</sup> Hefele,<sup>19</sup> and Rickert<sup>20</sup> are silent on the matter.

The chief argument advanced by the proponents of the "bad" school is the already mentioned conversation with Eckermann in which Goethe is quoted as having said: "Da muss man doch gestehen, dass man es sich selbst nicht vollkommen gedacht hat. . . . Und wenn ich nun gestehen muss, dass Herr Delacroix meine eigene Vorstellung bei Szenen übertroffen hat, die ich selber gemacht habe, um wieviel mehr werden nicht die Leser alles lebendig und über ihre Imagination hinausgehend finden!"

Besides Eckermann's report, the "bad" commentators base their position on the undeniable fact that the scene prepares the reader for Gretchen's execution, on Mephistopheles' identification of the beings as "Hexen," and on the occasionally pejorative meaning of "kochen" (e.g. in lines 2392 and 4058).

A considerably smaller group (Roethe,<sup>21</sup> Schmidt,<sup>22</sup> Krogmann,<sup>23</sup> Ebering,<sup>24</sup> and Atkins<sup>25</sup>) believes that good spirits are hovering over the *Rabenstein*. They contend that the purpose of the scene is not so much to prepare us for Gretchen's impending execution as to foreshadow her ultimate salvation—an interpretation supported by the fact that the words "Ist gerettet!" had not yet been added to the "Kerker" scene. Mephistopheles' designation of the creatures as "Hexen" who "kochen und schaffen" is dismissed as a palpable evasion of Faust's question and, together with the final "Vorbei! Vorbei!" as an expression of his uneasiness at the proximity of good spirits and his anxiety to get past them quickly. Anyway, as Stuart Atkins has pointed out, Mephisto is a liar whose statements can never be taken at face value. Atkins also senses a note of irony in Goethe's praise of Delacroix's illustration. Roethe seems to have been the first

<sup>17</sup> R. Buchwald, *Führer durch Goethes Faustdichtung* (Stuttgart, 1949), p. 150.

<sup>18</sup> H. Baumgart, *Goethes Faust als einheitliche Dichtung* (1893-1902), 2 vols.

<sup>19</sup> H. Hefele, *Goethes Faust*, 3rd ed. (Stuttgart, 1946).

<sup>20</sup> H. Rickert, *Goethes Faust* (1932).

<sup>21</sup> Krogmann (see Note 23) quotes from Roethe's "Die Entstehung des Urfaust" (Berl. Sitzgs. Ber., 1920), p. 656.

<sup>22</sup> *Goethes Werke*, ed. E. Schmidt (1925), I, 715.

<sup>23</sup> W. Krogmann, "Die Szene 'Nacht. Offen Feld' in Goethes Faust," *Neophilologus*, XVI (1931), 191-194.

<sup>24</sup> Emil Ebering, *Goethes Faust* (Berlin, 1934), pp. 386-387.

<sup>25</sup> Stuart Atkins, "A Reconsideration of Some Misunderstood Passages in the 'Gretchen Tragedy' of Goethe's Faust," *MLR*, XLVIII (1953), 421-434.

to link the word "streuen" with the rose-strewing angels at the end of Part II. Krogmann thinks that if the beings were witches, Mephisto's "weiss nicht" would make no sense, since he knows of the impending execution and would certainly know what witches would be doing on the scene. Finally, Minor has somewhat reluctantly reported an alleged conversation between Goethe and Friedrich Förster which, if authentic, contradicts his words to Eckermann:

Ueber die vielbesprochene *scene am Rabensteine* gibt es ein äusseres zeugnis, das bisher ganz unbeachtet geblieben ist. Friedrich Förster erzählt in seinen erinnerungen: "Kunst und Leben" (s. 37 fg.) betitelt und von G. Kletke herausgegeben, folgendermassen: "Ich erlaubte mir, es war vielleicht 1822, gegen die darstellung von Cornelius die bemerkung, dass er unmöglich die tiefe bedeutung der darstellung hier verstanden habe. Der dichter, so schien es mir, habe wol im sinne gehabt, den rabenstein, auf welchem am nächstfolgenden tage Gretchen ihr haupt auf den block legen sollte, durch blumenstreuende engel weihen zu lassen. Statt dessen gibt uns Cornelius einen teufels- und hexenspuk, womit Mephistopheles Faust belügen und betrügen will und deshalb mit: "Vorbei! vorbei!" eiligst mit ihm davon reitet.—"Mich haben," bemerkte Goethe, "die beiden vortreflich galoppierenden reiter auf den schnaubenden rossen so in anspruch genommen, dass ich die scene auf dem rabensteine noch nicht mit bedacht angesehen habe; sie mögen wol das richtige getroffen haben."—Wenn freilich der bericht des zeugen so unzuverlässig oder falsch ist, wie das meiste was er über Schiller gesagt hat, dann haben wir ihm für denselben wenig zu danken.<sup>26</sup>

During the century-old controversy on this scene, the actual text has always been forced to fit the preconception of the commentator. The word "streuen," for example, which Roethe, Krogmann, and Schmidt interpret as the strewing of roses by angels, means to Schröer, witches strewing ashes; to Loeper, witches strewing magic herbs; to Trendelenburg, ghosts strewing sand. A systematic comparison of how key words are used in other contexts of *Faust*,<sup>27</sup> however, reveals that while "schaffen," "schweben," and "beugen" are used by Goethe in such a general way that they could apply equally well to good or bad spirits, four other words: "weben," "neigen," "streuen," and "weihen" are regularly employed in senses which suggest their application to good spirits.

The word "weben," glossed by many commentators<sup>28</sup> as "to move constantly," is actually used only once by Goethe in this unspecific

<sup>26</sup> J. Minor, "Zur scene am Rabenstein," *ZfdPhil*, xx (1888), 77-78.

<sup>27</sup> Using Hohlfeld's *Wortindex zu Goethes Faust* (Madison, 1940).

<sup>28</sup> E.g. Düntzer, Ebering, Schröer, Trendelenburg.

sense (395), though one doubtful use (1119) might be interpreted as belonging in this category. Except for two occurrences in the very limited special meaning of "thinking" (1923, 1935), "weben" and its derivatives are always used in *Faust* to express the creative activity of the divinity working through nature (447, 503, 506, 508, 2715, 3449, 3845, 5344).<sup>29</sup>

Though "neigen" might be called a "neutral" word because of its thirteen appearances in the sense of "inclination," its three striking applications to the Holy Virgin (3587, 3617, 12069) seem more apposite in a scene so closely linked with Gretchen's death and salvation. For the same reason, "streuen" suggests angels rather than demons and Roethe is certainly right in associating it with the rose-strewing angels of "Grablegung." Finally, with one exception (1766), Goethe always uses "weihe" in its religious sense (2825, 8285, 8588, 8659, 11852).

A realistic analysis of the scene, taking into account equally Faust's "good" imagery ("weben," "neigen," "streuen," "weihe") and Mephistopheles' "bad" imagery ("kochen und schaffen," "Hexenzunft") must, it seems to me, conclude that the ambiguity is intentional and that the "good-bad" controversy has missed the point. Either one activity is being seen through different eyes, or there are two activities, each seen by only one of the speakers. In support of the first of these two possible interpretations, Professor Browning writes: "The imagery employed by both Faust and Mephisto is entirely motoric and completely self-exclusive; if we accept one view, we cannot accept the other. It describes the same activity seen through the eyes of man and devil."<sup>30</sup>

The second interpretation would assume an *objective* as well as a subjective duality in the scene and affirm the presence of *both witches and angels* on the *Rabenstein*. This interpretation is supported, if not actually proved, by a comparison of "Nacht. Offen Feld" with the "Grablegung" scene of Part Two, where both good and evil spirits battle for Faust's soul. An interpretation of "Nacht. Offen Feld" in terms of "Grablegung" is justified by still other parallels between the two scenes. Both scenes are penultimate in their respective parts. Each scene is associated with the death (and salvation) of one of the two principal persons. "Nacht. Offen Feld" is followed by "Kerker,"

<sup>29</sup> A fact already noticed by R. M. Browning, "On the Structure of the *Urfaust*," *PMLA*, LXVIII, No. 3 (June, 1953), 485-486.

<sup>30</sup> Browning, p. 486.

in which Gretchen rejects physical rescue in favor of spiritual salvation; "Grablegung" is followed by "Bergschluchten," where Gretchen is the instrument of Faust's salvation. "Weißen" (4403) is matched by "geweihten Ort" (11852). There is a clear parallel between "streuen" (4403) and the rose-strewing of "Grablegung."

The assumption of both good and evil beings in this short scene has the further advantage of reconciling Goethe's words to Förster (c. 1822) and Eckermann (1826). Goethe would have been the first to admit that the artist is not always fully conscious of the multiple implications of his own creation. That such was the case with "Nacht. Offen Feld" is strongly suggested by these words to Förster: "Mich haben die beiden vortreflich galoppierenden Reiter auf den schnaubenden Rossen so in Anspruch genommen, dass ich die Scene auf dem Rabensteine noch nicht mit Bedacht angesehen habe; Sie mögen wol das Richtige getroffen haben" and by these to Eckermann: "Da muss man doch gestehen, dass man es sich selbst nicht vollkommen gedacht hat."

University of South Carolina

DOUGLAS F. BUB

## REVIEWS

Edward I. Selig, *The Flourishing Wreath: A Study of Thomas Carew's Poetry* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1958. ix + 185 pp. \$3.00. Scholars of the House Series, 2). MR. Selig's object in this book is to raise our estimate of Carew's poetry; his principal means is to convince us that what we have admired as charming and expert artifacts expressive of an ideal of courtly society are, rightly apprehended, redolent with "subsurface complexities," ironies, tensions, and ambiguities, in the modern manner.

After an introduction which goes over the ground covered by Dunlap's review of "Carew's Early Reputation" and carries the survey up through Leavis and Bush, the first chapter sets out to justify to modern critical criteria Carew's apparently simple and conventionally courtly verse-compliments 1) by claiming that where

the poet seems guilty of the typical Petrarchan absurdities of hyperbole he is in reality—though perhaps “unintentionally,” or unconsciously—“parodying the tired Petrarchisms,” “indulging in a form of poetical horseplay” (p. 20) and thereby opening up those conventions “to our ironic contemplation” (p. 22); and 2) by arguing, along the lines of praise always extended the poet, that “if the hyperbole is extravagant and commonplace as idea, it is decorous and original as technique . . .” (p. 28). Few have denied Carew the second justification, but as regards the first I remain unable to read such a poem as “The protestation, a Sonnet” (p. 109 in Dunlap), for example, as “nothing less than an ironical treatise upon the extravagances of the Petrarchan sonneteers” (p. 21).

One may be surprised, after the first chapter's exposure of Carew's ironic dealings with courtly convention, to discover Selig in the next chapter affirming that since the type of the Elizabethan song-lyric, to which Carew's verse-compliments are near akin, relies “upon the most immediate and most dynamic properties of words to suggest a unified emotion,” “the serviceability of the Petrarchan motifs . . . lies in their instantaneous appeal as conventional expressions of broad and universal feelings” (pp. 43-44). We quickly learn, however, that “the song-lyric is not so unambiguous as it appears to be on the surface” (p. 50), that it is composed of not one but two “voices”: the singing voice of the conventional, impersonal poet “singing of an ideal state of affairs,” and the speaking voice of the individual man concerned dramatically with a specific lady and “talking about the facts of the situation” (pp. 53-54). The advantages of hearing two voices instead of just one are clear—we have immediately ambiguity, inevitably tension, and are enabled to discern “an implicit irony at the heart of the song-lyric” (p. 55).

The third chapter turns to an analysis of what Selig terms Carew's “golden symbolism,” using *golden* “to describe the texture of a kind of poetry which immediately affirms intrinsic values to the exclusion of all that is ugly or recalcitrant” (p. 60). Golden poetry is thus to be identified with what R. P. Warren called “pure” poetry—poetry which excludes all that Selig has been wont to name the “recalcitrant.” Now a “pure” poet is quite the opposite from an ironic poet, since the latter is characterized by his readiness to include the “recalcitrant.” Either Selig wants to have it both ways at once or he is confused; certainly his classifying Carew as “golden” is incompatible with his major effort to persuade us that Carew's verse

is *not* so pure, or golden, as we have supposed, that it is in fact impurely ambiguous, ironic, and so forth. Yet this confusion or failure of clarity does not bother me so much as the deliberate choice of *symbolism* to denote Carew's imagery and its "prevailing patterns." In the first place such metaphors as chains of love and pearly tears—dead or dying even in Carew's day—cannot be called symbolic in any sense of the word that maintains its elemental distinction as an image of more than ordinary dimension and power; and in the second place I cannot perceive that the incidence of snowy bosom in one poem deepens, or enriches, icy heart or melting love in another, as on the contrary the recurrence of swan, or tower, or moon in Yeats, for example, does accumulate force and significance. Carew does not work with symbols; he builds blocks of domesticated images into new and graceful structures and thereby recaptures something of the original efficacy inherent in the traditional materials. His poems do not articulate and so reveal a new reality, of whose power they partake; they reaffirm with a degree of skill exciting admiration and delight the established mode of a courtly society.

The work of the fourth chapter is specifically to analyse the kinds and degrees of Carew's departures from or revitalizations of the conventional matter and mode in a group of selected lyrics, a group of "Donnean" poems, and the lyrical epitaphs. This is the principal work of the book at large, and once more complications and ironies are found to arise from the interplay between the conventional and the personal. The chapter contains some perceptive remarks upon the differences between Carew's and Donne's conceits (p. 103) and a clear delimitation of two kinds of Carew's poems, the "song-lyric" and the "speech-lyric" (not the tense dialectic of the singing and the speaking "voices" in one poem, but separate kinds). The fifth chapter explicates five poems "which represent, perhaps, the heart of [Carew's] lyrical achievement," and chapter 6 discusses the verse-epistles and the elegies.

My comments upon these chapters are appropriate, by and large, to the entire book. On the one hand, I am unconvinced of the real presence in the poems of those ambiguities, ironies, and philosophical implications Selig introduces, and on the other hand I consider much of his analysis unnecessary, being no clearer than the verses themselves, lengthier, and less engaging. This is not to imply that Carew is without a kind of poetical complication, or richness, warranting

critical exposition<sup>1</sup>—though certainly most of his poetry is perfectly available to the sort of person who would be likely to read him. It is rather, I suspect, that Selig has not experienced the poems at first hand but has dealt with them through a preconditioning set of assumptions and terms incongruent with them, so that he has not realized Carew's own kinds of involvement but has constructed, above the poems, as it were, a network of commentary in itself compelling, and corresponding well to its modern critical prototypes, but touching only occasionally upon Carew's verse. When I leave Selig and handle the poems again, his superstructure topples.

After the lengths to which the former chapters sometimes proceeded, the conclusion appears very moderate and just, recognizing Carew's self-imposed limitations, within which he achieved an excellence of kind, and maintaining that "at the least . . . Carew is often one of the happiest and most delightful love-poets the English language has produced" (p. 178), a claim that has been generally granted the poet from his own time to ours.

Except for frequent passages—usually involved with Carew's ambiguities and ironies—that tend to a turgid cant, the book is fairly well written; and it is attractively printed and bound.

This is Mr. Selig's first book, produced while he was still an undergraduate. As such, it is remarkably able. I expect, and hope, that he will write others.

Syracuse University

R. A. DURR

**Arthur Sherbo, *English Sentimental Drama* (East Lansing, Mich.: The Michigan State Univ. Press, 1957. ix + 181 pp. \$4.50).** THIS book is an inductive essay in definition of the "genre" of sentimental drama. After a preliminary review of the work of his predecessors,

<sup>1</sup>There are, for example, the readings of "A Song" ("Aske me no more") by Brooks, Purser, and Warren, *An Approach to Literature* (New York, 1952), pp. 362-363, Earl Daniels, *The Art of Reading Poetry* (New York, 1941), pp. 364-366, and Mark Van Doren, *Introduction to Poetry* (New York, 1952), pp. 3-8, the last of which, especially sensitive to the complications of the poem's tonal effects, Selig seems not to have read. These analyses represent the sort of critical attention some few of Carew's poems might profit by. There are also occasional cruxes in his verses which call for commentary; see, e.g., Donald C. Baker, "Carew's *Disdain Returned*," Expl., XL (1953), item 54. Where Carew is difficult—the first stanzas of "A Looking Glasse," for instance—Selig is not often helpful (pp. 77-78).

eighteenth-century and modern, Mr. Sherbo describes and abundantly illustrates a series of qualities characteristic of sentimental plays: "Repetition and Prolongation" of situations provocative of emotional intensity; "Eschewal of Humor and the Bawdy"; "Emphasis and Direction" of a nature to heighten emotional effects—these and other more subtle qualities. Mr. Sherbo uses to notable advantage a series of comparisons between Elizabethan and seventeenth-century plays, on the one hand, and eighteenth-century plays, on the other, in the treatment of similar themes. He displays an extensive knowledge of English drama in the choice of his illustrations. In a final chapter on the "Popularity of the Genre," he reviews the relevant eighteenth-century critical commentary as well as the theatrical history of "sentimental" plays. Unlike his chief predecessor Ernest Bernbaum, he makes no effort to associate literary sentimentalism with intellectual history; and unlike Bernbaum he gives negligible attention to the expression of sentimentalism in non-dramatic literature. The name of the third Earl of Shaftesbury significantly does not appear in his index; nor do those of such prominent modern students of the origins of sentimentalism as Ronald S. Crane and Ernest L. Tuveson.

This, then, is not a study in intellectual history but rather one in the rhetorical or artistic qualities of a group of plays. Because the term "sentimental" to Mr. Sherbo is always pejorative, the book becomes an investigation of a special kind of artistic degeneracy—of a kind which he believes constitutes a dramatic "genre." It is here, in his conception of his subject as a genre susceptible to systematic description, that I find the book least satisfactory.

He apparently thinks of sentimental drama as having existence ideally (in Plato's sense), much as the young Pope of *An Essay on Criticism* thought of the several classical genres as having existences apart from their accidental occurrences in specific ancient and modern works. His effort to establish the criteria which distinguish sentimental drama resembles the effort of Pope and other neo-classical critics to formulate inductively the "rules" of the classical genres—though he works in reverse in that he seeks the qualities typical, not of good plays, but of a special type of bad plays. His confident conviction that he has something absolute to define and describe allows him to devote extended attention to the effort to determine whether given plays—*Love's Last Shift*, for example—are or are not sentimental.

In any effort to define "sentimental drama," we must remember

what we are defining—a term which did not come into being until the mid-eighteenth century, after the neo-classical doctrine of kinds or genres had lost most of its hold on the minds of literary theorists, and a term furthermore which was not the subject of close scrutiny until the twentieth century. The earlier eighteenth-century dramatists were ignorant of the term; and the eighteenth-century plays which conspicuously exploit emotional situations are heterogeneous in structure as well as in social and moral assumptions. As Mr. Sherbo makes abundantly clear, many of the plays which have long been considered sentimental do not meet his criteria. What is served by saying that some of the plays with a strong emotional emphasis are sentimental and others are not—decision depending on the completeness with which a set of criteria of twentieth-century origin is observed? The “genre” of sentimental drama as presented in this book is a construct of Mr. Sherbo’s devising; and it is one which introduces needless complexity into the subject it is intended to clarify.

Mr. Sherbo has ignored at considerable loss the unifying theme in eighteenth-century literary sentimentalism which Mr. Bernbaum emphasized—the ethics of benevolism. Mr. Bernbaum approached “The Drama of Sensibility” by way of intellectual history: in particular, by way of seventeenth and eighteenth-century ethical theory. Drama then, as always, was sensitive to changes in patterns of interpretation of behavior, and the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries happened to be a period when the patterns were changing rapidly—notably, from those of ethical theories assuming human depravity to those of ethical theories assuming human benevolism. Non-dramatic literature, as well as comedy and tragedy, reflects, not steadily but fitfully, new, secularized attitudes and psychological explorations. The second and third epistles of Pope’s *Essay on Man*, among many other documents, provide an exposition of the ideological background for the passages in drama which we commonly call “sentimental.”

And Reason raise o’er Instinct as you can,  
In this ’tis God directs, in that ’tis Man.

We can scarcely neglect these lines—and the vast literature in ethical theory of which they are an epitome—if we would understand the intent of eighteenth-century dramatists and of novelists and non-dramatic poets in focusing attention on the emotional reactions of their characters. Mr. Sherbo’s conception of his task provides no room for suggesting the profound affinities between the expressions of senti-

mentalism in drama and the cognate expressions in non-dramatic literature—in Fielding's *Tom Jones*, for example. Further, Mr. Sherbo's conception of genre forces him to establish criteria which are altogether too limiting. His criteria, to illustrate, would exclude *The School for Scandal*, with its implied evaluation of the brothers Surface according to benevolistic ethics; just as they would ignore the similarity between the implied evaluations of the two sets of brothers in *Tom Jones* and in *The School for Scandal*.

It is the necessary, I think, that we distinguish between two referents of the adjective "sentimental": the one a quality of emotional excess in literature of any period; and the other a quality characteristic of an historical movement in literary history which in England began late in the seventeenth and ran through most of the eighteenth century. The two meanings are related, and both of them are applicable to many eighteenth-century plays. But they are distinct, and the confounding of them can only prevent us from understanding the full artistic and intellectual significances of some important innovations in eighteenth-century drama.

My fundamental objection to Mr. Sherbo's book is thus a methodological one—that by gratuitously assuming the existence of a genre not recognized by most of those who wrote the plays now assigned to it he provides a barrier rather than an aid to us in our effort to organize our thought about English literary history, notably in that his conception of genre obscures the relationship between the change in drama represented by sentimentalism and the major contemporary change in all departments of English literature. I recognize the theoretical nature of my criticism, and I must in fairness temper it by saying that, methodology apart, the book is carefully prepared and that it contains a large amount of information on the subject. I object to certain details of his exposition: for example, his use of such an impressionistic term as "sincerity," which has at best a biographical meaning. But I recognize the thoroughness with which he has carried on his investigation and the learning he has brought to it. Whatever the status in critical or metaphysical theory of the "genre" of sentimental drama, he certainly has succeeded in describing with new precision sentimentalism in drama.

Stanford University

JOHN LOFTIS

Albert Gérard, *L'Idée romantique de la poésie en Angleterre: Etudes sur la théorie de la poésie chez Coleridge, Wordsworth, Keats et Shelley* (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1955. 416 pp. Bibliothèque la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 136). Jacques Voisine, *J.-J. Rousseau en Angleterre à l'époque romantique. Les Ecrits autobiographiques et la légende* (Paris: Didier, 1956. x + 482 pp. Etudes de Littérature Etrangère et Comparée, 31). Bice Chiappelli, *Il Pensiero Religioso di Shelley* (Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1956. 130 pp. Vomini e Dottrine, 4). Michele Renzulli, *John Keats: L'Uomo e Il Poeta* (Roma: Francesco Giordano, 1956. 468 pp.). OF these four books on the English romantics, the two most significant contributions are those of Gérard and Voisine. *L'Idée Romantique* is a brilliant systematic analysis of the shared esthetic basis of romantic thought in England. *Rousseau en Angleterre* examines the reception and influence of Rousseau's autobiographical writings and of the Rousseau legend in England between 1778 and 1830. Chiapelli's book on Shelley's religious thought is a short monograph in which Signorina Chiapelli concentrates on the early tract, *The Necessity of Atheism*, and the late vision-poem, *The Triumph of Life*, with some account of the development of Shelley's religious views in the interim. Renzulli's *Keats* is a straightforward birth-to-death biographical study which takes account of the poems as they appear.

As Gérard summarizes his thesis, the 18th century "avait élaboré, tout en les laissant épars, les éléments dont la réunion au début du dix-neuvième siècle, constituerait une vaste synthèse, harmonieuse et équilibrée, encore que présentée en ordre dispersé, la synthèse romantique." His study centers on the poetic theory of Wordsworth and Coleridge, Shelley and Keats, with some incidental attention to the critical writings of Hazlitt. He excludes Byron, despite some incontestable affinities between his work and that of his major contemporaries, not least because (as others have periodically discovered) "comme théoricien, il n'existe pas." In six admirably documented chapters, the author defines and evaluates the English romantic conceptions of the poetic experience, philosophical idealism, cosmic dynamism ("La Créativité Universelle"), the creative imagination, organic sensibility, and poetic form. Students of the period may take issue with the author on some of the minutiae of his extensive and exhaustive argument; but he so strongly buttresses the central points of his position that they are not likely ever to be overturned.

Henri Roddier's searching study of Rousseau in 18th-century England has found a worthy successor in the beautifully organized study of Voisine, which carries up to 1830 the account of Rousseau's English reputation and influence. At no time between his death and the year 1830 can Rousseau be said to have won universal acceptance among the English élite. At first sporadically admired by groups as various as provincial nature-lovers like Walpole and Scottish intellectuals like Reid and Beattie, Rousseau's reputation wavered beneath the hostile attacks of Burke. Yet English liberals gave new currency to his political and educational theories, while the poets, in a series of vigorous reactions carefully chronicled by Voisine, helped to erect a legendary figure whose shortcomings were apparent to all but the fierce partisan Hazlitt but whose dimensions were too large to be ignored. Students of English romanticism will profit from a reading of the chapters on Godwin and Mary Wollstonecraft, on Southey and Coleridge in the Pantisocratic period, on Wordsworth (the best study of the subject we have), and on Byron and Shelley. The fifth part is given over entirely to William Hazlitt, upon whose life and work the influence of Rousseau was profound. American and English scholarship owes a conspicuous debt to Voisine for the thoroughness and the scope of his work.

Miss Chiappelli's monograph, which contains a preface by Mario Praz, opens with a discussion of *The Necessity of Atheism*, offering further arguments to support the "acuta intuizione" of F. L. Jones and the confirmatory suggestions of K. N. Cameron that Hogg, rather than Shelley, was the real author of the document. She concludes this section with a useful summary of Shelley's gradually deepening comprehension of the meaning of Christ's ministry and personality (in the years 1812-1822). The second part offers a fresh and revealing analysis of *The Triumph of Life*, in which the author takes careful issue with several previous interpretations, and in particular with the prevailing view of Iris, the rainbow-seraph in Rousseau's section of the poem. She also advances the arresting suggestion that Shelley modelled his "Carro della Vita" on the Arch of Constantine bas-reliefs, which he had described to Peacock as early as the spring of 1819. Despite its comparative brevity, this monograph adds appreciable strength to the view that Shelley was spiritually a Christian, despite marked doctrinal differences.

Renzulli's life of Keats rounds out a biographical trilogy whose other members are *La Poesia di Shelley* and *Lord Byron, Il Peccatore*.

A workmanlike performance designed to bring Italian readers into possession of the most recent scholarly work on Keats, the book presents its findings in a graceful running narrative which, however, adds little beyond a few minor details to what has been previously known about the facts of the poet's life and the interpretation of his poetry. Misprints are unhappily frequent and sometimes comic, as when the fair Madeline is called a "marmaid" or when Keats is made to refer to his early poems as "blights" rather than "flights."

Princeton University

CARLOS BAKER

Lord Byron, "*Don Juan*": *A Variorum Edition, IV Vols.*, ed. Truman Guy Steffan and Willis W. Pratt (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1957. Vol. I: xvi + 397 pp.; Vol. II: xxvi + 503 pp.; Vol. III: vii + 569 pp.; Vol. IV: vi + 406 pp. \$30.00). SELDOM has more labor and careful scholarship been expended in the determination of a text and in delineating the history of its composition and explicating its meaning than in this four-volume edition of Byron's *Don Juan*. The editors, who have joined their labors in establishing the text, have examined all the extant manuscripts in Byron's hand and the copies made by Mary Shelley, and every cancelled word and revision that was decipherable has been recorded. Using the first edition of each canto as the basic text, the editors have given under each stanza the variants in order from the several manuscripts, indicating the source by symbols, and have added rejected stanzas and their variants at the end of each canto. A few legitimate alterations of the basic text have been made for the purpose of following as nearly as possible Byron's intentions. For example, the editors have adopted the readings of the fifth edition of 1822 for Cantos III, IV, and V, corrected copies of which Byron had sent to Murray with instructions that they be followed in all future editions. Open to question, however, is the policy of the editors, so meticulous in other ways in preserving every word as the poet wrote it, of modernizing some of Byron's habitual spellings such as *scull* for *skull*. But all in all the variorum text is invaluable for the serious student of Byron's poetry.

In the first volume, *The Making of a Masterpiece*, an omnium gatherum of Steffan's studies of *Don Juan* as a poem, the significance

of the changes Byron made in the course of composition is discussed at length. In the first part, the "Chronicle," Steffan has attempted to outline all that Byron "thought, felt, did, and said about the writing and publishing of *Don Juan*." None of this is new, but brought together it heightens the realization of the substance out of which the poem was made and the growing consciousness of the poet that he had found his forte in this "versified Aurora Borealis." Part Two, "The Anvil of Composition," contains the most thorough analysis of Byron's additions and emendations to the text of *Don Juan*. Steffan here examines the motives that led Byron to add digressive stanzas: his exuberance, his love of the sport of accumulating allusions and of image-making, and the indulgence of his speculative and contemplative bent, and finally his desire to find an outlet for his personal whims and prejudices and to create a catharsis for his most corroding passions. In studying the extent of the revision, he has found that, despite Byron's protestations that he was too indolent to revise or correct, he spent a great deal of care in the revision of the earlier cantos, but whether from laziness or indifference or want of time or opportunity, or perhaps because of increased facility, his revisions fell off markedly after the first five cantos had been written. A close comparison of his early trials with the final text shows that most of Byron's revisions were designed to strengthen the poetic and satiric impact of his lines. They were verbal changes that made the expression more vivid, sharp, and precise. His aim was to avoid clichés and heighten the poetic surprise that drove his meaning home. In other words, Byron had as much interest as other poets in finding the word or the phrase with the right nuances.

In the last volume, containing the notes to the text, Pratt has given the most complete annotation to be found in any edition of the poem, adding his own notes to those of E. H. Coleridge and of Moore and others in the Murray edition of Byron's works (1833). He has added much that is useful to a modern reader which earlier editors had not thought necessary, such as translations and more precise references for classical quotations or allusions, and has given some biographical information which the nineteenth century editors did not know or suppressed. Faced with the eternal problem of the annotator, however, he has erred a little on the side of annotating the obvious, forgetting apparently that this is an edition for scholars rather than for the general reader or the undergraduate. It is difficult to see why common Shakespearean references like the phrase "murder sleep"

or Biblical allusions like that to Lot's wife should be annotated by simple identification in such an edition. But most of the notes are clear, precise, and useful.

One should not be picayune in evaluating this labor of love which should do much for Byron scholarship. Now if someone would only have the patience and the ardor to construct a concordance to Byron's poems, the tools for future study would match those available to students of other major English poets.

Rutgers University

LESLIE A. MARCHAND

**Gordon N. Ray, *Thackeray: The Age of Wisdom, 1847-1863* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958. xv + 525 pp. \$8.00).** THIS is the

second and concluding volume of Professor Ray's long-projected biography of Thackeray. Like its predecessor, *Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity, 1811-1846*, published in 1955, the present work draws largely on manuscript material to which the author alone has had full access. The result is a massive and scrupulously documented study, based throughout on new material and certain to remain the definitive presentation of Thackeray's life.

The first volume ended on a rising note with the triumphant reception of *Vanity Fair*, and the resulting stabilization of Thackeray's position as a leading Victorian novelist. With the arrival of fame and financial security the elements of uncertainty which made the earlier years so lively and adventurous necessarily diminished; and the story of Thackeray's later career in Professor Ray's handling is at once less eventful and more sombre, as the reader traces the decline of powers which so quickly passed their prime. The most dramatic episode of this period was Thackeray's infatuation with Jane Brookfield. On this Professor Ray sheds much fresh light, illuminating its significance in the novelist's otherwise impoverished emotional life. Indeed, almost the sole exception to Professor Ray's admirably impartial and judicious discussion of Thackeray's extensive social and literary relationships is his version of the inconclusive Garrick Club affair, which needs to be qualified by a more sympathetic awareness of Dickens' side of the matter.

The fact that the success of *Vanity Fair* fixed Thackeray's status vis-à-vis the age enables Professor Ray to present his subject more

fully in the context of the milieus which conditioned his activities than was the case in the previous volume. Thus, the first chapter charmingly evokes the novelist's domestic life with his daughters in Kensington, while the second describes the "great world" which increasingly subscribed to his gentlemanly pretensions. Yet, it is interesting to note that he never lost his hankering for Bohemia, and that he continued to frequent the jollier scenes which had known him in his apprentice years as a writer. It is not Professor Ray's fault that Thackeray remains a curiously indistinct figure. His very inability or unwillingness to identify himself exclusively with any of the so widely divergent environments in which he kept a foot contributes to a general impression of instability which may well have had its origin in the loneliness to which he was condemned by his wife's insanity. There is irony (no doubt intentional on Professor Ray's part) in the sub-title of the present volume, "The Age of Wisdom." For it is difficult to perceive that advancing years brought Thackeray any true measure of wisdom beyond his ever-widening knowledge of the ways of the world.

And this failure to grow either in mind or spirit is reflected in Thackeray's writings, especially after *Pendennis* and *Esmond*. Professor Ray attributes the anticlimactic quality of the later work to a slackening of the imaginative impulse, though without much attempt to explain the circumstances. He again explores, as he first did in *The Buried Life* (1952), the relevance of Thackeray's own history to an understanding of his books; but while identifying the extent and nature of the novelist's indebtedness to the actual facts of his life, he does not go on to investigate the *artistic* uses to which Thackeray put first-hand experience. Since Professor Ray set out to write a straight biography, he is not, of course, to be criticized for the absence of critical commentary which was not part of his purpose. Yet, he does insist on Thackeray's importance as an artist and not simply as a representative Victorian man of letters; and this may well lead the reader to seek amidst the evidence so meticulously marshalled by Professor Ray for clues to a fuller comprehension of Thackeray's loss of creativity after his initial successes.

Despite its brilliance and scope of achievement, the thing that is missing from Thackeray's career is any consistent sense of direction, and does not the same hold for his writings? Perhaps his faults may all be subsumed under the statement that he lacked serious commitment, either in his life or in his work. The point can be made by

putting him in company with Dickens, George Eliot, and Henry James, three writers with whom he shared certain distinguishing qualities of genius, yet each of whom was indisputably a greater writer.

Certainly Dickens alone among his contemporaries challenges Thackeray on the score of breadth of early experience and opportunity. Whereas, however, the hardships of Dickens' formative years developed the savage integrity which informs his indictment of his age in the great later novels, Thackeray, as his proneness to adopt pseudonyms and *personae* in part attests, was never able to achieve an attitude of critical detachment from existing values. Again, Professor Ray stresses in Thackeray a breadth of intellectual cultivation comparable with that of George Eliot. Yet, the profundity of philosophic theme embodied in the latter's fiction has no counterpart in Thackeray's novels, of which the best that Professor Ray can say is that they gave currency to "his modest ideal of the middle-class gentleman, admittedly for an age and not for all time, but appropriate and practicable."

And finally, Professor Ray gives examples to illustrate the psychological realism of Thackeray's treatment of character, as well as his stylistic mastery. These endowments seem, however, to have been accompanied by little of the self-conscious concern for the writer's craft which we encounter in Henry James. Indeed, the one real omission in Professor Ray's biography is that he tells us so little about Thackeray's aesthetic theories, his methods of composition, or his opinions of other writers. One derives the impression that there is little to tell, and that Thackeray was quite as much wrapped up in his social as in his professional career, valuing the success of the one largely in relation to the other. And this may explain why Thackeray's novels of manners, for all their accuracy and vividness of surface effect, lack the objectivity and formal perfection of James' work in the same mode. Transcendent neither in form nor in content, the Thackeray who emerges from Professor Ray's pages is entrapped in the nineteenth century as Dickens and Eliot and James are not.

*Princeton University*

E. D. H. JOHNSON

John Ruskin, *Diaries: Vol. II: 1848-1873*, selected and ed. by Joan Evans and John Howard Whitehouse (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1958. x pp. + pp. 365-770. \$11.25). IN a letter of 1858 John James Ruskin, answering a criticism that his son's "meddling with Political Economy might weaken his Influence in matters of Art," writes as follows: "I hope the public . . . will not suppose his Geology also a deviation from the right path. From Boyhood he has been an artist, but he has been a geologist from Infancy, and his geology is perhaps now the best part of his Art . . ." (Cook and Wedderburn, VIII, xxvi). Approximately a third of Volume I of *The Diaries of John Ruskin*, published in 1956, is taken up with descriptions of mountains and clouds. In the first half of Volume II, the work here under consideration, geological matters occupy an equally important place. The first two volumes of the diaries, then, reflect the emphasis that Ruskin always placed on the science of geology defined in the broadest sense. We are reminded that his first published prose consisted of notes on the color of the Rhine and on mountain structure, that *Modern Painters* is full of geological observations, that all through his life he turned to geology for escape and relaxation. In describing natural phenomena Ruskin learned to write and think, and we see him in these diary entries developing the combination of accurate analysis and vivid panorama that marks his style and accounts for much of the authority and beauty of his works.

Architectural notes also occupy a large place in the first half of Volume II, continuing the emphasis in the latter part of Volume I. From 1848 to 1853 the diary entries show that Ruskin was developing the ideas and the stylistic patterns of *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* and *The Stones of Venice*. We know from other sources that he was reading the works of Willis, Lindsay, and other exponents of the Gothic revival. Ruskin has few reading notes in the manuscript diaries, and those few are usually excluded by Dr. Evans (J. H. Whitehouse, owner of most of the diary manuscripts used, died during the early stages of work on the edition).

It is surprising that Ruskin has so little to say in the diaries about economics (a page in 1862 and a sentence in 1866). However, in the latter half of Volume II, which covers the period of *Munera Pulveris* and the first part of *Fors Clavigera*, the entries become fragmentary. Much of this part of the diary deals with the state of his health. Seldom does he have as much as half a page of sustained writing, and

then usually to describe a dream, some of them quite pleasant, by the way, and only one about a snake.

Since some of this material, especially whole pages that contain nothing but dates and place names, might have been summarized at the beginnings of chapters, and since only ten minor omissions occur in the second half of Volume II, one is led to question the principle governing selection of material in Ruskin's *Diaries* as published so far. In Volume I, with the exception of unreproduced sketches, the footnotes list only six omissions, all apparently minor. In Volume II a rough count shows sixty omissions. Forty-five of these rejected entries are on the subjects of architecture and geology, some of them running to as many as thirty pages. In the absence of explanation or apparent justification for the discrepancy in inclusiveness in the two volumes, the reader assumes lack of sufficient editorial planning.

In Volume II itself a spot check of textual comparisons with Ruskin's other works reveals some oversights. For instance, all diary entries which Ruskin uses in *Praeterita* are footnoted except those for July 13 and 15, 1849, and May 10, 1854. The biographical footnotes of Ruskin's acquaintances are better in Volume II than in Volume I, in which Frederic Harrison, three years old when Ruskin began to publish, is called Ruskin's first editor (I, 209). But the practice has been retained of listing some of the names again and again with full dates and biographical data. It is doubtless calculated to aid the inattentive reader; instead it leads the reader to suppose that the editor is inattentive.

Improvement of these and other details would have been facilitated by simultaneous publication of all three volumes of the edition (a third volume with complete index has been promised for later publication). The avoidance of serial publication, however, would have forced us to wait years longer for access to this major Victorian document.

The volume is profusely illustrated with diagrams and sketches, about half of those in the manuscript, and with many of Ruskin's drawings and paintings. The biographical headpieces to each year's diary perform well their function of continuity for the diffuse content. It is a beautiful book, always a peculiarly fitting circumstance when Ruskin's works are published. The general note should be one of gratitude.

University of Florida

JOHN TYREE FAIN

Joseph Anthony Mazzeo, *Structure and Thought in the Paradiso* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1958. xi + 220 pp. \$4.50). THIS volume is a collection of six essays which have appeared since 1955 and are here reprinted with some additions and revisions. The essays are independent, but have a common focus, as suggested by the book's title. Professor Mazzeo's comparative method, moreover, gives the essays a unity of perspective as well. It is "in relation to platonic tradition and 'experience,' [that] elements of the structure and organization of the *Paradiso* become clearer, and this part of the *Comedy* appears as a particular form of 'erotic flight' through levels of reality and awareness" (p. viii).

The first essay, "Dante and the Phaedrus Tradition of Poetic Inspiration," serves as "both an introduction and an example of one way of synthesizing the remaining sections of the book" (*Ibid.*). Its central concern is with that interplay of love and beauty (as light) to which "the universe of the poem is finally entirely reduced" (p. 1). Dante is moved by the love elicited by Beatrice's beauty, seen as light reflected from the source of all light, and the pilgrim ascends as that light becomes brighter and hence more desirable. Beatrice's beauty, which was corporeal and therefore imperfect, passed over into incorporeal beauty after her death, and became, in the poem, the lure drawing the pilgrim heavenward. This love engenders poetry as well, "revealing through inspiration and dictation the highest truths which the poet takes down" (p. 7). Thus, "the poet rises to or has direct and supernatural contact with the absolute source of truth and beauty" (p. 8). Dante's poem, then, amounts to a reconstruction, "in extraordinary detail," of the Phaedrus doctrine of salvation and love (p. 2).

The remaining essays deal at great length with one or more of these themes. The second discusses Dante's conception of poetic expression in detail, with particular reference to allegory and metaphor. The fourth concentrates on the vision itself, and places Dante's understanding of the experience in the Pauline tradition, while the last essay is concerned primarily with "sun symbolism" and the medieval metaphysics of light. The rest of the book develops the main thesis of the first essay—Dante's conception of love and beauty and its relation to Plato or the platonic tradition—to which the remainder of this necessarily brief review will be devoted.

The Christian notion of love and its development (or decline, as some would have it) during the Middle Ages, present a problem to modern historians precisely because of the admixture of "platonic"

elements. *Eros* is self-centered love, for it seeks the satisfaction of its own desires, whereas Christian love seems to require a total renunciation of self; its extreme form is expressed in St. Paul's wish to be "anathema . . . a Christo" for his brothers (Rom. 9, 3). Pierre Rousselot was among the first to examine the problem, stated in this way, and he offered a solution which few have accepted (*Pour l'histoire du problème de l'amour au Moyen Age*, 1909). Pierre Duhem saw the dichotomy clearly, but expressed it with a traditional spatial metaphor: *Eros* is man's upward desire for God as the *summum bonum*, whereas Christian love is marked by the downward movement of God to man, and the subsequent transformation of man's love. It was the pseudo-Dionysius, introducing the latter concept, who bequeathed to posterity a neoplatonism "profondément transformé par le Christianisme" (*Le Système du monde*, 1916, IV, 355). Hermann Scholz was among the first to bring Dante into the argument, by calling him the greatest poet of *Caritas*, hence diametrically opposed to Plato (*Eros und Caritas, Die Platonische Liebe und die Liebe im Sinne des Christentums*, 1929, p. 95, cited by Nygren, *infra*). Anders Nygren agreed, but distinguished *Caritas* from *Agape*, calling the former a mixture of *Eros* and *Agape*. In the pages Nygren devoted to Dante, he placed the great poet of the "Augustinian caritas-synthesis" midway between Plato and the New Testament doctrine of love, which had to wait for Luther in order to be restored to Christian thinking (*Agape and Eros*, tr. Watson [1932], 1953, pp. 55, 616-621). These are only a few of the high-points in a discussion of great philosophic and historic importance, which continues in our own day.

Unfortunately, Professor Mazzeo makes no mention of any of the above studies, and seems to have overlooked some of the complexities his predecessors so painstakingly pointed out. The debate between Catholics and Protestants about how well Dante represents a "Christian" philosophy of love would have never arisen had not the platonic currents in all medieval speculations on the subject been disturbingly obvious. By reviving the comparison between Dante and Plato without exploring extensively the differences between the two, or facing up to Nygren's contention that *Eros* and "true Christian love" are incompatible, Professor Mazzeo has failed to contribute as much as he might have toward our understanding of Dante's conception of love. Had he taken the discussion into account, he would have felt

more strongly the need to explain *how* Dante's *Amore* could have been "erotic" and Christian at the same time.

In a refutation of Nygren's thesis, Martin D'Arcy suggested that the most important factor to keep in mind when discussing the presence of *Eros* in Christian theology was the distinction between nature and grace (*The Mind and Heart of Love*, 1947, p. 70 ff.). The present study makes this distinction briefly and inadequately on pp. 133-4, where we are told that "Dante places the whole erotic ascent [of the *Paradiso*] in a charismatic framework. His experience is ultimately a result of grace . . .," which was "bestowed through the instrumentality of the beauty of a person." The author's understanding of "grace" is peculiar, however, for he maintains that Dante's is a "natural" journey (*Ibid.*), although the quote from *Purg.* XVII, 91 ff. does not substantiate this assertion. Dante's point is that the voyage is stimulated by "lo raggio della grazia" which kindles "verace amore" (*Par.* X, 83), and Professor Mazzeo does not adequately explain how this motive force is compatible with what he supposes is Dante's "love nostalgia." In other words, *Eros* in a "charismatic framework" ceases to be *Eros* at all, for love in a platonic context is the *consequence* of previous participation in the absolute, whereas Christian love is the *cause* of man's union with God (cf. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique*, 1944, p. 215).

In the platonic view, the passion of the soul to return to the "plain of truth" after having fallen into the world of matter is explained in terms of memory. Terrestrial beauty recalls to the soul that eternal Beauty which it once beheld, and thus begins the series of ecstasies which cause the soul to return to its home, by means of the "ladder of beauty." Dante, we are told, having experienced a love nostalgia, recapitulated this circular theme, but since no Christian is permitted to believe in the pre-existence of souls, he "found an equivalent for the platonic notion of *anamnesis* in the doctrine of the special creation of each individual soul. The previous contact with the absolute came in the moment of its creation [*Purg.* XVI, 85 ff.]—not in a vision in a pre-existent state" (p. 60). This observation, although it requires qualification, will lead us to the central problem: What happens to the "erotic" pattern in a Christian framework?

Professor Mazzeo gives the impression that Dante had to *seek* an orthodox equivalent for the pre-existence of the soul, but, as a matter of fact, such an equivalent was everywhere present in the theology

of the Middle Ages. One must distinguish, first of all, between Plato's circular theme as eschatology (or history) and as moral psychology. Origen used it in the first sense, with his theory of universal restoral (*ἀποκατάστασις*), whereas Gregory of Nyssa interpreted it morally—the soul begins in sanctity (the "image" of God), falls, and returns to sanctity (*Contemplation sur la vie de Moïse*, tr. Daniélou, 1943, p. 79; omitted in text of Migne, *PG* XLVI)—thus avoiding the Origenian "heresy." In the Middle Ages, two patterns emerge: historically speaking, man was created in grace, sinned, and through the redemption was ultimately restored. Morally speaking, any moment of the soul's existence can recapitulate this history, for beginning from grace (after original sin has been removed), each time the soul falls into sin, it can be restored by grace. Finally, Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise, as states of the soul after death, can be seen as anagogic equivalents of sin, life and restoration. The state of grace is thus substituted for the plain of truth, sin for the fall, and the grace of God for the attraction calling the soul home. If one feels inclined to compare Dante's poem to Plato's myth, then these considerations must enter into the comparison, to avoid distortions of history and of the text.

Understood in this way, the survival of Plato's myth in the tradition, and hence in Dante's poem, shows how *Eros* was modified by Christianity. Our outline, crude and brief as it is, suggests that God is the cause of a return to God, and this God Who descends to man is far indeed from a Beauty which never comes off its pedestal. The passage which the author cited as the soul's "contact with the absolute" should rather be understood as a natural contact—the *summum bonum* as absolute—and hence as the implanting of the *natural* desire for happiness, itself another complex problem. For *supernatural* desire we must await the *Paradiso*, the poem's literal equivalent of "the plain of truth." This kind of information, as Virgil tells us, can come only from Beatrice.

Professor Mazzeo hoped "to clarify certain problems of Dante criticism concerning the role of Beatrice in the *Comedy*" by assuming the platonic or medieval neoplatonic perspective on love and beauty (p. viii). It is precisely in the figure of Beatrice, however, that we see the great divergence between *Eros* and *Amore*, and hence the inadequacy of that perspective. The author himself makes this clear:

The soul of the lover of beauty in both Dante and Plato ascends to immaterial beauty, but in Dante the beloved is not left behind on the bottom rung

of the ladder, or at the first stage of the process. The beloved is transformed and elevated in her death—she achieves a greater immaterial beauty—and precedes the lover up the ladder acquiring greater and greater degrees of beauty as she ascends (p. 132).

Thus, platonism does not help in understanding Beatrice as that “extraordinary juxtaposition of the intensely personal with the universal,” as suggested on page 139, for it is not the initiation of desire (common to Dante and Plato) which is unusual but rather the fact that the beloved remains with the lover in his ascent. This notion of a concrete-universal is quite foreign to Plato. He is interested in Beauty insofar as it is universal, and specifically dismisses the idea of an individual beauty (*Symposium* 210). *Eros* is by its very nature a refusal to remain rooted to the particular (cf. Nygren, p. 179), and little is therefore gained by using the term to describe the attraction of Beatrice's beauty. One must turn instead to the Christian idea of Incarnation to see a fusion of particular and universal at all analogous to that embodied in Beatrice.

As for the distinction between corporeal and immaterial beauty, a point made by Thomas Aquinas might be of some relevance here. Thomas, who is quoted on beauty, was very careful to distinguish beauty in itself, and beauty in relation to a subject. In the first case, it is identical with goodness (and therefore indistinguishable from being), in the second it need not be (*S. T. I*, 5, 4). It would be rash to suggest that Dante was a Thomist in this respect, but the fact remains that the poet distinguishes *piacer* and *bellezza* in Beatrice's speeches, *Purg.* XXXI, 50 and XXX, 128, the first to signify her corporeal beauty, the second her beauty after death. Professor Mazzeo gives the translation “beauty” in both cases (p. 21), but surely the distinction is clear between a *perceived* beauty (Thomas defines this as “*id quod visa placet*”) and beauty in itself. It may be that Dante did not distinguish carefully throughout the poem, but if the distinction is made at all, then Beatrice's former corporeal beauty may have nothing to do with her transcendent beauty in the poem, and the continuity of the “erotic” stimulus might then be questioned. *Piacere* and *bellezza* seem to differ in kind, and not just in degree of perfection.

It is probably clear from these remarks that the platonic perspective raises more difficulties than it settles when it focuses on the *Paradiso*. So limited a perspective is acceptable in a single essay, but in a book-length study, this limitation results in distortion unless that other

perspective, more uniquely Christian, is assumed as well. For this reason, one must infer that these essays constitute only a few of Professor Mazzeo's stimulating insights, and not his vision of the whole.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

JOHN FRECCERO

John N. Pappas, *Berthier's Journal de Trévoux and the Philosophes* (Geneva: Institut et Musée Voltaire, 1957. 238 pp. *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, 3). EVER since Voltaire wrote his amusing account of the illness, confession, and death of the Jesuit Berthier it has been difficult for the student of French letters not to be very much against Berthier and the *Journal de Trévoux*, or perhaps very much for them and very much against Voltaire.

The truly remarkable thing about this most worthwhile study is the fact that its author seems to be genuinely and sincerely fair to both sides—to Voltaire and all the *philosophes* on the one hand, and to the *Journal* and its principal editors on the other. The figure of Berthier that emerges from these pages is most certainly a believable one and would seem to be very close to the real one. Berthier was a devout Catholic and he firmly believed that tolerance in matters of religious doctrine was tantamount to an attack upon that doctrine. Such attacks, he felt, fomented republicanism and if allowed to continue would destroy the Church entirely, thus removing the only impediment in man against fanaticism, and so opening the doors to violent revolution. But at the same time Berthier was a man of his age, a product of many of the same forces that shaped the *philosophes*: his blunt, bold condemnation of the weak king and vicious ministers is quite as daring as anything Fénelon wrote in his famous letter to Louis XIV, though like this document it was not issued publicly but has come down to us only in manuscript form; scarcely less bold was his condemnation of various social evils, in burning words that appeared in print as part of the historical notice to his edition of a French translation of the Psalms. The author also compares his concern with the peasant's plight to that of La Bruyère, and his views on education to those of Diderot.

The relations of Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot with Berthier are fully explained and documented in separate chapters. Each conveys information not readily to be found elsewhere in studies

on the Enlightenment. We are more used to reading about the boldness and the final stands of these writers than about their diplomacy and somewhat wavering positions, but the latter are no less important.

A very recent, long, and careful study by Alfred R. Desautels, S. J., *Les Mémoires de Trévoux et le mouvement des idées au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, 1701-1734*, no doubt appeared too late to be utilized by Dr. Pappas. The two books, however, do not cover the same ground, the earlier study stopping in 1734, and the present one beginning more or less in 1745. One may say that they complement each other almost perfectly. Moreover, the first is concerned principally with large issues, such as the attitude of the *Journal* toward "malbranchisme," "newtonianisme," "quiétisme," "gallicanisme," and the like, whereas Dr. Pappas is mostly concerned with the relations of Berthier with the leading figures of the Enlightenment. The bibliographies of the two studies also complement each other.

Minor errors, and omissions like that of J. Daoust's "Les Jésuites de Trévoux et Diderot," which appeared in the *Visages de l'Ain*, July-September 1952, do not detract from the real worth of the book. The bibliography of manuscripts and printed works is short but good; the index is useful. On all counts, the study deserves to be read.

New York University

ROBERT E. TAYLOR

Theodore Besterman, ed., *Les Lettres de la Marquise du Châtelet* (Geneva: Institut et Musée Voltaire, 1958. Vol. I: 389 pp. Vol. II: 337 pp. Publications de L'Institut et Musée Voltaire, Série d'études III, IV). THIS publication has two centers of interest. The first volume and half of the second are very much about Voltaire. They constitute a necessary complement to *Voltaire's Correspondence* for the fifteen years from 1734 to 1749. Letters for the period 1745 to 1747, Voltaire's "wasted" years at court, are scarce, however. And in 1748, Saint-Lambert takes over. The story of Mme du Châtelet's passionate love for him is told with all its fascination and tragic overtones in the second half of the second volume. These are primary sources. Many of the documents come from the *Alfred Morrison Collection of Autographs*, long neglected by scholars. Mr. Besterman rightly considered these to be practically unedited.

Voltaire's love letters to his niece, Mme Denis, also published by

Mr. Besterman, had already confirmed the implications of the *Lettres d'Alsace*. Voltaire, to be sure, was the first unfaithful. But that episode was far from possessing the all absorbing quality of Mme du Châtelet's passion. She loved Saint-Lambert "à la folie," "avec dé-  
mence," and insisted that he love her in return "avec excès," for in love, "assez n'est pas assez." The painful assumption that during the last year of her life Voltaire's interests were almost completely sacrificed is only too clearly borne out. Fidelity must be envisaged with all its eighteenth-century connotations. Mme du Châtelet was not averse from entering into an "affair" to further her intellectual or financial interests, with Maupertuis, for example, and her Belgian agent, Charlier; inconsequential perhaps, but her fidelity in friendship to such former lovers as Maupertuis and Richelieu was one of her most characteristic traits. Saint-Lambert changed all that. She was at first almost insanely jealous of the kindly Mme de Boufflers, "cette dame de volupté" and mistress of Stanislas, who had recently had an affair with Saint-Lambert and in whose good graces it was of the utmost importance for both of them to remain. The passionate love of the matronly Emilie, with its fatal aftermath, must have been an awesome and embarrassing experience for the young officer. Even so, her doubts concerning the durability of his fidelity may not have been well founded: his fifty-five year long liaison with Countess d'Houdetot was soon to prove his mettle. All in all, Mme du Châtelet in love offers fascinating psychological insights that Voltaire in love can hardly match.

To return to Voltaire, it would be futile here to touch upon the numerous aspects of his life and works that make of these volumes a necessary addition to Voltairean scholarship. They should be read in conjunction with Voltaire's own letters and with reference to Professor Ira Wade's studies on Voltaire and Mme du Châtelet, which were of great value in the editing of these volumes. Mr. Besterman has been able to double the number of letters previously published and has rectified texts and dates with his usual meticulousness and competence.

We learn about the *Mondain* and Mme du Châtelet's translation of Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*, about corrections of *Mahomet* (Voltaire feared that the miracle at the end might prove to be too strong medicine for the Parisian public), about the composition of *Zulime* (Voltaire is ill and "when he is ill can only write verses"), and many another literary piece; nothing about the Baron de Gangan, however,

and all too little about *Zadig*. One reference to the last work (II, 170) may be of special significance. *Zadig* (and not *Memnon*) had been read at Nancy by early May, 1748. Both Pierre Boyé and Durival (reported by G. Ascoli) asserted that the first edition of *Zadig* was published in Nancy in the early spring of 1748: Boyé says by Leseure, Durival by Lefevre. Perhaps some lucky book collector will yet lay his hands on a copy of this edition.

Columbia University

NORMAN L. TORREY

**Charles Baudelaire, *The Centennial Celebration of Baudelaire's "Les Fleurs du Mal"* (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1958. xvii + 59 pp. \$2.00).** THIS delightfully illustrated volume is a masterpiece of printing, better suited perhaps to an edition of the poems of Baudelaire than to critical articles devoted to them. The highly competent articles included are hardly intended for specialists, but directed rather to informed and intelligent readers.

In the foreword, Professor Henri Peyre skilfully touches on such essential aspects of the poems as their characteristic blend of classicism and romanticism, and their psychological content: "Poetry, with him, rivalled the novel in density and in riches" (p. xiv). Graduate students in comparative literature will find a suggestive comparison between Baudelaire and Meredith as deeply analytical poets.

Professor W. T. Bandy gives a clear, concise and yet highly factual account of the Poe-Baudelaire relationship. In discussing the merits of Baudelaire's famous translations of the tales, he sides with L. Lemonnier and P. Quinn, who do not consider this rendition a decided improvement on the original text. While I agree with this opinion, I should add that Baudelaire's stylistic approach to mystery and fear is quite different from that of Poe. Take the "Fall of the House of Usher": the American smothers or drowns his readers in a thick atmosphere of horror, whereas the translator tends to evoke a duel between the narrator and an unknown, but spatially defined, force of evil.

M. Marcel Ruff boldly asks: "in exactly what form is evil present in 'Les Fleurs du Mal'?" As an answer, he furnishes the reader with an *exposé* of noteworthy sins dealt with in the *Flowers* and then

discusses the poet's general attitude towards delinquency. Baudelaire, according to Professor Ruff, "considers the guilty as victims and presents a theological explanation of their errors: they are 'seekers of the infinite'" (p. 47). And rather than depict wicked deeds as such, the poet stresses the *idea* of evil—an evil that is "essentially metaphysical" (p. 50). In this manner, Baudelaire expresses the tragedy of all mankind rather than his own moral suffering. Although M. Ruff's "Evil in the Flowers," which presents in capsule form the burden of his *L'Esprit du mal et l'esthétique baudelairienne*, contributes to our knowledge of the *Fleurs du mal*, I feel that the method followed consists in reducing the poems to so many moral pronouncements or metaphysical maxims.

Mr. Paul Engle, no less than Marcel Ruff, insists on the moral qualities of the *Flowers of Evil*. But the American poet, standing on the solid ground of his own creative experience, makes his case more convincing if less "scientific." His moving essay brings out the heroic virtues inherent in Baudelaire's impassioned dedication to his art and stresses his inner consistency. Uncompromising honesty—rather than sincerity, which is at best an ambivalent term—appears to be the key word in Professor Engle's eloquent assessment of Baudelaire's life and work.

Sincerity and theatricality, however, are important issues in the four remaining papers. This poetic virtue (or license), which seldom precludes self-deception, is wittily analysed by Mr. Donald Justice, who remarks: "The poet—the sincere poet—becomes a performer, a charlatan, a great pretender; art is artifice. What he has to be sincere about is his art. The idea of depersonalization of the artist . . . is a by-product of this attitude" (p. 39). With good reason, Mr. Justice, himself a poet, insists, in Baudelaire's writings as well as in his behavior, on "the pose which is a form of sincerity."

In Ralph Freedman's essay, Baudelaire appears as dramatist rather than actor. Brief, perceptive commentaries on various poems reveal the intensity of this dramatization, which to a certain extent results from the poet's impassioned self-examination—a "self-examination through which he discovered the interplay of contradictory forces, Good and Evil, Self and Other, within himself" (p. 58). Tension between the outside world and inner experience explains in part the actuality of the *Fleurs du mal*.

Roger Shattuck makes even greater use than Professor Freedman

of textual analysis. His brilliantly speculative, but somewhat loosely organized, article is packed with remarkable insights, such as:

Every "vaporization" of our minds in encountering the outer world must lead to a "centralization," a reciprocal movement back toward our own consciousness. The alternation rhythm of these two movements is the secret of the creative process. (In 1865, Claude Bernard gave scientific method its classic definition in almost identical terms.) (p. 20)

If this be true, dramatic tension must become a form of knowledge and a method of discovery, and the poet himself will be "elevated" to the status of thinker, in a manner quite different from the one envisioned by M. Ruff. But rather than assess the noetic value of poetry, Professor Shattuck uses this reflexiveness to explain Baudelaire's assumption of the role of actor. After questioning his sincerity, the critic examines a fundamental theme, which may well lie beyond both sincerity and pose, that of death. And Mr. Shattuck skilfully interprets "Une Martyre" and "Une Charogne" (a poem analyzed with equal competence by Mr. Freedman), showing the importance of stark realism in Baudelaire's poetic sensitivity.

*University of California, Los Angeles*

J. D. HUBERT

**C. F. MacIntyre, trans., *French Symbolist Poetry* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1958. viii + 150 pp. \$1.50).** CE volume de vulgarisation comprend une préface, 41 poèmes (textes et traductions en face), des notes de documentation et d'éclaircissement et une bibliographie.

Une brève préface ne pouvait évidemment amener la clarté et la distinction là où de longues études ont également échoué, à savoir dans un domaine aussi confus et hétéroclite que celui étiqueté "poésie symboliste." Les notes, abondantes, sont bienvenues. L'humour qui est parfois adopté dans le ton pourra sembler forcé ou facile, mais il est bon de ne pas toujours penser "poésie" et "poète" avec de divines majuscules.

Les poètes élus sont Nerval, Baudelaire, Verlaine, Corbière, Mallarmé, Rimbaud, Laforgue et Valéry. Pourquoi pas Verhaeren ou Ghil? Pourquoi pas surtout Apollinaire qui, par les dates et l'esprit, appartient sans doute au moins autant à la période que Valéry? Mais

de telles questions, qui pourraient s'étendre au choix des poèmes, sont parfaitement oiseuses.

Considérons plutôt le rapport des traductions aux textes (dans lesquels sont demeurées quelques erreurs typographiques). L'anglais et le français sont des langues prosaïquement assez proches (surtout dans la prose abstraite) mais poétiquement très éloignées. Les textes où la musicalité particulière au français est le plus exploitée (par exemple la dernière strophe de *Clair de lune*) présentent évidemment une tâche impossible au traducteur. D'autre part, les tournures de la langue, qui ne sont pas spécifiquement poétiques, mais dont certains poètes, par exemple Laforgue, font grand profit, donnent lieu nécessairement, dans la traduction, soit à un aplatissement, soit à la création d'un effet nouveau. Enfin il y a la valence complexe de certains termes qui, selon les cas, passe ou ne passe pas, sans que le traducteur y puisse rien.

Ces impossibilités étant rappelées, il faut reconnaître au livre présenté l'alliance des connaissances et du talent. Les rimes ou assonances que le traducteur recherche font perdre peu de précision à l'ensemble. (Je me demande simplement si la traduction du vers de Laforgue: "Que ne suis-je morte à la messe!" par: "If only I don't die at Mass!" peut être justifiée.) L'anglais n'étant pas ma langue maternelle, je laisse à d'autres le soin de juger de la valeur poétique de ces traductions. Je me risquerai toutefois à louer le traitement de *Chanson d'Automne*, puisque le traducteur attire, dans ses notes, l'attention sur ce poème en disant qu'il présente "le défi suprême."

En résumé, cet ouvrage de vulgarisation me semble bien remplir sa tâche difficile et mériter d'être répandu.

Indiana University

ROBERT CHAMPIGNY

**Wolfgang Lange, *Studien zur christlichen Dichtung der Nordgermanen, 1000-1200* (Göttingen: Vanderhoek and Ruprecht, 1958. 304 pp. Palaestra, 222).**

THESE studies in the Christian poetry of the old Norsemen keep much more than the promise of the title-page. For the book brings not only an interpretation of the four sacred skaldic poems of the twelfth century, which was to be expected, but also all the scraps of verses or formulas from 1000-1200 referring to or dealing in any way with Christianity or Christianity versus paganism. This, the texts, is contained in the first part of the book.

The second part deals with the historical background of Christianity in Iceland, the Christian namegiving or proper names after 1000, the Christian kennings in poetry, a sketch of the Germanic Sun worship, a history of the Christian poetry in Iceland, with an excurs about the Old Icelandic Homily.

In making use of contemporary skaldic poetry, the author without doubt taps the most reliable source available for his research, better far than the much later sagas. Nowhere, presumably is it possible to feel the syncretism of the early converts as in the poets of the conversion like Eilífr Goðvúnarson, who composed a long tough and obscure poem in honor of Þórr but also at least one verse to praise White-Christ. Or Hallfreðr vandræðaskald, who first eulogized one of the latest of the heathen princes, and then the first missionary king Ólafr Tryggvason.

This book is full of meat. No one before has pointed out that women skalds, for some reason, disappear with the advent of Christianity. Is that due to St. Paul's general disapproval of women? The religious-historic and literary treatment of *Plaucítusdrápa* is better than I have seen anywhere else; I wish I had known that when I was writing the chapter on medieval sacred poetry in my *Literary History of Iceland*. Likewise the author would have been better off if he had read my article on the origin of the meter (rimed *runhenda*) of Egill Skallagrímsson's *Höfuðlausn* rather than Halvard Lie's theories which derive the rime from the formulas of the *prima signatio*, O. Icel. *prímssigning*. However that article probably came too late for his use. That would certainly not have been true about F. J. E. Raby's *History of Christian Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages* (first ed. 1927, second ed. 1953) which I am surprised not to find in the author's bibliography. Another even stranger gap is all of Sigurður Nordal's work, except the article on Egill Skallagrímsson's religion. How the author could leave out such key works for his theme as Nordal's *Völuspá* and *Íslensk menning* is certainly beyond my understanding.

But in spite of these odd omissions the book is really a fine work of which author and publisher alike may be proud. It would be greatly appreciated if the author would go on with his history from its present termination at 1200 and bring it down to the Reformation.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

**Jost Hermand, *Die literarische Formenwelt des Biedermeiers* (Giessen: Wilhelm Schmitz Verlag, 1958. 191 pp. Beiträge zur Deutschen Philologie, 27).** IF "scholarship" is to be more than being a

successful administrator who knows how to "play the academic game," books which are wrong must be so labeled. This dissertation shows industry and ambition, but it is confused and comes to no conclusions. The author starts with inconsistent definitions to get at his period concept, "Biedermeier." He then proceeds to discuss German literature of the first half of the nineteenth century according to the genres of poetry and fiction. He leaves out the essays and pays as little attention to the sociology and politics of the individuals as to the international scene, where after all verse epics also flourished without having their justification in a "Biedermeier." Nor does he do more than reject the fact that the style of furnishings and clothing was called Biedermeier. He does not show any knowledge of contemporary satirists and periodicals. What is worse, he combines with an unhistoric dialectics, termed "Geistesgeschichte," the superciliousness of the modern critic and supplies ample samples of that kind of "criticism" which comes so easy and brings such fame to its manipulators. He completely overlooks that in the period under consideration other standards prevailed; for he is interested in talking like a modern critic. This yields a rambling outline based on derivative literature rather than source study, notwithstanding ample readings of sources. But to call this "Untersuchung," is to make the word mean its opposite.

The very history of the term is inadequate. "Biedermeier" was a living word for a furniture style and a style of life when I was a boy, surrounded by such furniture and by people who were born in the eighteen-twenties and thereafter. Some of them still wore the same fashions which we see in the pictures of Romantic painters. The *Blaue* and *Braune Bücher*, published by two brothers Langewiesche, favored especially that period, and books by Houben, Boehn and Hermand and many others referred to "Biedermeier" as a matter of course and of common understanding. In 1925 Stoessl wrote on Stifter and called him, as was more customary in Austria, the poet of the "Vormärz," to signify that his was the time before the 1848 revolution. That became the beginning of the new "Biedermeier" discussion. This is owing to the fact that "Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen" was to be based on the then fashionable "Geistesgeschichte," which actually was nothing more, in most cases, than

making that which one did not know and had no intention of studying into a sufficiently vague system of words which supported one another as only closed systems can. Thus "Biedermeier," a noun, became suddenly a Pandora's box from which one drew whatever one chose, and of course a box which was separated (like the words themselves) from another box, called Romanticism, and another, called Realism, etc. Since these all overlapped in reality and thus could not be period concepts at the same time, the discussion as to what "Biedermeier" *really* is could go on for ever. For it obviously can only *be* what we want it to *mean*.

Our author handles his dialectics rather poorly, which is a promising sign after all. According to p. 6, "Biedermeier" is to mean "jene Dichtung, die den restaurativen Ruheraum zu einer epigonenhaften Vielschreiberei missbraucht oder die sich bewusst auf die Seite der politischen Reaktion stellt," but on p. 8 we admit: "Die Biedermeierdichter bekannten sich zwar in den seltensten Fällen öffentlich zur politischen oder weltanschaulichen Restauration." We decide on p. 10: "am fruchtbarsten hat sich der biedermeierliche Ruheraum auf dem Felde der Wissenschaften ausgewirkt," but only to discover on p. 10, that "die Tonangebenden waren daher nicht die konservativen Denker, sondern die liberalen Elemente." This means then that the "Biedermeier" scholars were no "Biedermeiers" or that the definitions make no sense or that using this term serves no purpose. Besides, of course, we would like to know in which circle someone is "tonangebend," because some forty years in all of Germany cannot very well be considered uniform. Yet this is exactly what these noun-terms pretend to produce.—Ranke *was* "tonangebend" and he was a conservative, but he would never have seen himself as a "Biedermeier"; in fact he said he belonged in the eighteenth century. For "Biedermeier" was *then* merely a figure like Joe Palooka or Major Hoople.

Our author seems satisfied when he has given a poor summary of almost anything he has read, be it Muschg's Gotthelf or an introduction to the Grimm *Fairy Tales*, without making this meaningful for his context, so that at times he reads like an outline of a young man's history of German literature. But the pretentiousness of it all, the many asides to critics and historians, and the self-assured manner of deciding who "belongs" where make the book the most painful I have ever had the bad luck to review. When our author says that Saphir "belongs to" the "Bereich der Jean Paul-Tradition" he says nothing about Saphir except that he could be a novelist, a satirist,

a humorist, an aesthete, etc. But which of these he *really* was we never learn, since the author apparently saw his goal achieved when he had made his "Zuordnung." Sometimes of course he slips badly.

Hegel slipped too when he was intoxicated with his own system and took his model of reality for reality itself. The scientists revise their preconceptions when an earth satellite tells them that there is more cosmic radiation in outer space than theory led to expect; they then know that their theory must be faulty. But what if there is no distinction between theory and reality, when the model is supposed to be the reality, when the verbiage of the modern critic or pretended historian is supposed to be the facts themselves? We all make mistakes, but mistakes that derive from dishonesty are outside the realm of scholarship. I had to point out such mistakes before. It is my sad duty to point out the aimless fibbing of this young dialectician as well.

In reading Muschg's Gotthelf books he came across Zschokke in connection with Pestalozzi and Gotthelf. This he retained and felt compelled to regurgitate when discussing either Gotthelf or Zschokke; but he slips in his guesswork when he pontificates: "So wurzelt der Schweizer Erzähler Zschokke noch ganz in der protestantisch-aufgeklärten Tradition seines Landes und bildet ein wichtiges Bindeglied in der Kette der Autoren, die im 16. Jahrhundert beginnt und über Pestalozzi schliesslich zu Gotthelf führt." Apart from the minor ineptitudes, wherein is he such an important link? And what has this got to do with the investigation attempted? But of course, it is nothing but associative use of words. This is why Zschokke who was born and raised in Germany is made into a Swiss. Or, if Switzerland became "his land," it cannot very well have determined by its traditions the "roots" of this "Swiss story-teller!" If this is synthesis, let us get to analysis!—Hermand deduced from general principles that "the Biedermeier" did not have dialect poetry. Whichever definition of "Biedermeier" we accept, Holtei's *Schlesische Gedichte* (1830 and often thereafter) and Seidl's *Gedichte in niederösterreichischer Mundart* (1844) will in all events fall under it and disprove the a-priori theory. Had the young doctor or his adviser looked into O. L. B. Wolff's old *Encyclopädie der deutschen Nationalliteratur* (1835 ff.), he could have discovered much more yet and could have also got the atmosphere of the period. But it proved too seductive

an appeal to talk about the authors that we *now* read and to sacrifice "the Biedermeier" for easy generalities.

We never get the feel of the "Biedermeier," perhaps because the intervening decades have made it impossible for this young generation of students to know it first-hand and thus to have a natural criterion for their combinations and wordage. But this is also due to lack of historical interest and proper guidance as well as to poor thinking. For instance, when Hermand comes close to a problem, he obfuscates its reality by his own dialectics: "Die Biedermeierdichter bevorzugten deshalb die Liebe der Eltern, die Kinder- und Geschwisterliebe oder die bräutliche Liebe, bei der das Erotische ausgespart bleibt." The true historian wonders and a sound logician even can see through the veil of his words. Either of them would therefore reconsider this term of "Erotics," since obviously the seemingly "sexless" love of the young "Burschenschafter," of all those Hase, Koethe (husband of Goethe's Silvie and author of some novels), Jacobs, Raumer, Ranke, Harless, was not and could not have been without Eros. They all produced offspring. Had Hermand followed up the matter of erotic idealization, he would have discovered some antecedents in the writings of Jacobi and Voss and Bouterwek, and it would have become clear that in terms of "love" there is no distinguishing between Romantics and "Biedermeiers" unless we narrow them down to a type, i.e., make them fit beforehand what we want to bring out later.

If many more such books appear and pass as scholarship, a generation will grow up completely separated from the past and from the ability even to study the past as it was once lived. If such easy verbalisation, and the word does fit excellently in this context, gets the rewards, the past will soon become a dangerously false projection of present-day dishonesty and sloth. Instead of learning from the past and becoming interested in another generation, reading over and over of this sort of "history," will result in the conviction that history is dialectics. To give an analogy and to sum up the matter let us assume an English scholar of today were in need of a good term to cover the first half of the nineteenth century. Instead of referring to Romantics, Realists, to some other term taken from political history, he decides on a fashion style or a furniture style or a comic figure from Cruikshank's *Comic Almanack*, let us say Thackeray's Stubbs. Would he then call the first half of the nineteenth century "the Stubbs?" And if he did, would he be taken seriously as a scholar

if he considered it a matter for discussion whether Thackeray belonged to "the Stubbs" or not?

Muhlenberg College

HEINRICH MEYER

**Gerhard Loose, Ernst Jünger. *Gestalt und Werk* (Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann, 1957. 380 pp.).** THAT Ernst Jünger acquired some of his friends "against their will," as he tells us in his diary (*Strahlungen*, 2. Aufl. [Tübingen 1949], p. 473), is not implausible; quite a few of his literary admirers must have felt the same initial reluctance. It is indeed no easy task to come to terms with this provoking writer, for his work defies the usual classifications, irritates by its apparent contradictions, challenges rather than appeases the sensibilities, yet, at the same time, is so full of startling beauty and stunning insight that it must be accepted as an integral part of modern German literature.

Since Jünger's work is largely an outgrowth of the political and historical events of the past forty years, it is not surprising that much of its criticism is tainted by the political and historical opinions of the critics. This does not necessarily invalidate their presentation: not all of Jünger's adherents are uncritical, nor all his adversaries merely derogatory. But one thing is certain, that from the wide range of ever changing perspectives Ernst Jünger stands out as the most controversial German author alive.

To examine with the naked eye a writer who has been viewed through so many colored glasses, is therefore no mean achievement. Yet this is unquestionably the first and most obvious merit of Gerhard Loose's recent book on Ernst Jünger. Professor Loose neither identifies himself with his author nor disavows him, thus avoiding both the myopic outlook of a Gerhard Nebel and the radical detachment of a Peter de Mendelssohn or J. P. Stern. He approaches his task first of all as an attentive, accurate, unprejudiced and patient reader, and consequently reaps the benefits of close adherence to the text. Blind to neither Jünger's strong points nor his weaknesses, he makes his most fortunate discoveries when comparing different versions of the same work. Thus his thorough examination of the successive phases of *Das abenteuerliche Herz*, *Atlantische Fahrt*, *Strahlungen*, adds much to our understanding of Jünger's artistic tendencies. That Mr. Loose

has included in his study a discussion of Jünger's political essays, is especially gratifying. For although these essays, published in now forgotten periodicals of the twenties, have been generally neglected, they form an essential part of Jünger's development.

Taking up the works in chronological order and striking a happy balance between deft summary and thematic analysis, Mr. Loose proves himself a conscientious guide through Jünger's spiritual landscape. However, of the two leading concepts named in the book's subtitle, *Werk und Gestalt*, *Gestalt* is the less clearly handled. To be sure, Mr. Loose offers a striking formula for it, the *Abenteurer*. Thus *Abenteuerertum*, adventurousness, appears as the recurring theme of Jünger's commando raids into the most diversified fields of human endeavor,—war and peace, metaphysics and politics, art and religion, science and mythology. From this center of his vision, Mr. Loose undeniably illuminates a great many aspects of his author. But one may ask whether such a formula, ingenious as it is, does full justice to the complexity of an author who transcends definitions, and whether Jünger really belongs among such figures as Columbus, Wallenstein, Cagliostro, Don Juan, Ivar Kreuger, Paracelsus, Casanova, and even Hegel (“*ein Abenteurer des Geistes*”), assuming that there is a common denominator of such a motley group. It may very well be that Mr. Loose's use of such a formula betrays the influence of his author, after all, for Jünger shows no small preference for this kind of typification (*Die Gestalt des Arbeiters, des Priesters, des Kriegers*, etc.).

Such a typological presentation, however, cannot and clearly is not meant to obviate a more historical approach. For Jünger is a historical figure within a definite historical process, not the unique and solitary mind which so many books make him out to be. The spiritual ancestry which he himself has established is quite impressive. Poe, Melville, Hölderlin, de Tocqueville, Dostoevsky, Burckhardt, Nietzsche, Rimbaud, and Conrad are listed at the beginning of *Strahlungen* as “Auguren der Malstromtiefen, in die wir abgesunken sind” (p. 9), *Malstromtiefen* which Jünger has constantly tried to explore. There are many more historical relationships. Friedrich Stählin, for instance, has drawn certain parallels with Novalis (*Muttersprache*, 1949), and Rainer Gruenther in a brilliant article in *Euphorion* (1952) has made a convincing case for Jünger's inclusion within the history of European Dandyism.

The most revealing insight into Jünger's craftsmanship might be

gained through a comprehensive investigation of his language. Of this there are promising beginnings (Dvorak, Hilligen, Jancke, Lachmann), not the least of which are a number of excellent contributions by Mr. Loose. It is just because he shows such a keen awareness of linguistic perfection that one is a bit surprised to find in his own book a slip here and there or an occasional stylistic carelessness.

Such minor flaws, however, cannot obscure the fact that Mr. Loose has laid the solid foundation for much future work. In my opinion, there is no better introduction into Jünger's thoughts, themes, and literary devices than this very able book.

Harvard University

BERNHARD BLUME

**Konunga sögur I-III. Ed. by Guðni Jónsson (Reykjavík [Akureyri]: Íslendingasagnaútgáfan, 1957. I: xxvii + 445 pp.; II: xi + 419 pp.; III: xi + 512 pp.).** THE Icelandic Saga Edition (Íslendingasagnaútgáfan) which started with *Sagas of the Icelanders* and *Sturlunga saga* and went on to produce the *Eddas*, *Mythical-Heroic Sagas*, *Sagas of Chivalry*, *Karlamagnúss saga*, and *Þiðreks saga* has now brought out a collection of *Kings' Sagas* some of which have not been printed in Iceland before, some quite rarely before. The first volume contains *Ólafs saga Tryggvasonar* by Oddr munkr, the *Legendary Ólafs saga helga*, and some fragments of his oldest saga. The second volume contains *Sverris saga* by Karl the Abbot and *Böglunga sögur*. The third volume contains *Hákonar saga gamla* and a fragment of *Magnúss saga lagabætis* by Sturla Þórðarson. As before the volumes are furnished with concise literary introductions and a good index, all done by the prolific editor Dr. Guoni Jónsson. Both he and the publishers deserve high praise for their labors: to produce good texts at popular prices.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

**Gösta Holm, *Syntaxgeografiska Studier över två Nordiska Verb* (Uppsala: Institutionen för Nordiska Språk vid Uppsala Universitet, 1958. 255 pp. + maps. Skrifter Utgivna av Institutionen för Nordiska Språk vid Uppsala Universitet, 4. \$4.60).** THIS is a thorough and interesting study of the syntactic relationship of two

auxiliary verbs, *fara* and *taka* and the geographical distribution of their use over many Scandinavian dialects and even presumably in English dialects, though the author shows that the Icelandic *hann fer að rigna* and English *it fares to rain* are no real parallels and could not go back to Viking times.

*Fara* and *taka* both have the sense "to begin" in Icelandic. But whereas *taka* was fairly common in Old Icelandic and in the modern literary language, *fara* was rare in Old Icelandic but has become very common in modern colloquial Icelandic. The development of both verbs seems to have been similar in the other Scandinavian dialects which have both verbs. This relationship was known in general in Icelandic but the author has filled in the picture with excerpts from works representing the different periods of Icelandic literature. He has also made use of dictionary collections in Reykjavik, Oslo, and Uppsala for the same purpose. The work is furnished with a good summary in English to which people can be referred.

Naturally there will be disputable borderline cases. Thus the sentence, *O, það tekur ekki að vera að nefna það* has nothing to do with the sense "begin" but means "Oh it is not worthwhile mentioning it" (p. 36 near bottom). As a sample of redundant use of *fara*, exemplified by a footnote on page 30 quoting by *Icelandic*, I should now like to quote a verse by the famous American Icelandic poet *Káinn* (see my *History of Icelandic Literature* [1957], pp. 345 ff.): *Sílkispjara sólín rara/ sín með ber augu/ ætlar bara að fara að fara/að fá sér gleraugu.*

*The Johns Hopkins University*

STEFAN EINARSSON

of  
in  
nn  
nd

ut  
rn  
ry  
th  
cts  
in  
om  
He  
nd  
ood

en-  
ith  
ing  
ura,  
uld  
oet  
(.):  
ad

N

Notes

at  
n  
n  
d  
  
at  
n  
ry  
h  
ts  
in  
m  
He  
nd  
od  
  
n-  
th  
ag  
ra,  
ld  
bet  
) :  
ad

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

## Shakespeare's Festive Comedy

A STUDY OF DRAMATIC FORM AND ITS RELATION TO  
SOCIAL CUSTOM

By C. L. Barber

The merry and idyllic comedy written in the first half of Shakespeare's career, from *Love's Labour's Lost* to *Twelfth Night*, is in Professor Barber's view primarily festive rather than romantic or satiric. It develops in dramatic form attitudes shaped by the traditional seasonal festivals that were part of Elizabethan culture. In this book, specific connections with the holiday tradition, many of them heretofore unnoticed, are brought together to show how the festivals provided a social form for experience parallel to Shakespeare's dramatic form.

276 pages. \$5

## Voltaire's Politics

THE POET AS REALIST

By Peter Gay

In a study that is carefully reasoned and brilliantly written, the author examines Voltaire's writings in their social and historical contexts and relates Voltaire's ideas for social reform to his experiences in 18th century European life and thought. Voltaire emerges not as a poet dabbling in politics or a salon-reformer, but as a tough-minded realist completely aware of and responsive to the political temper of his times.

384 pages. \$6

## The Advent Lyrics of the Exeter Book

Edited, with an Introduction and Translation, by Jackson J. Campbell

The Advent Lyrics, a group of Old English religious poems (formerly called *Christ I*) dating from the 9th century, are presented in this edition as an independent group of poems disengaged for the first time from Cynewulf's *Christ*. Professor Campbell's study focuses on the significance of the poems as lyrics rather than as philological documents. The book includes a full critical introduction, a new text and modern English translation (on facing pages), critical notes, and a glossary.

152 pages. \$3.75

Order from your bookstore, or

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS • Princeton, New Jersey

## Contents

The Subtler Language  
Dryden: *Epistle to Charleton*  
Denham: *Cooper's Hill*  
Pope: *Windsor Forest*  
Metaphors for Poetry  
Shelley: *Mont Blanc*  
Shelley: *The Sensitive Plant*  
Shelley: *Adonais*

368 pages; \$6.00

THE AUTHOR OF *The Finer Tone: Keats' Major Poems*, here proposes comprehensive critical readings of six poems by Denham, Dryden, Pope, and Shelley. By means of these analyses the book also displays the shift of basic poetic mode from that of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to that of the nineteenth century. The studies of the poems, which extend from 1642 to 1821, are arranged so as to trace the breakdown of the earlier cosmic assumptions and the foundation of private ones in the nineteenth century.

The author seeks to show that the organizational concepts within which the earlier poetry was written had disappeared by the nineteenth century, and that a representative Romantic like Shelley was required to develop his own personal world-picture. Whereas the earlier poets wrote poems that assume certain conventional world-pictures, Shelley interfused the creation of the poem and the creation of the cosmic design.

Therefore the analyses, which are the major purpose of the book, proceed by two different techniques. The first part of the book employs a method of reading literature prior to the nineteenth century, and the last half illustrates a procedure for reading literature of the past century and a half.

# The Subtler Language

CRITICAL READINGS OF  
NEOCLASSIC AND ROMANTIC POEMS

*Earl R. Wasserman*

Professor of English at The Johns Hopkins University, an editor of *ELH* and of *Modern Language Notes*, and the author of *Elizabethan Poetry In The Eighteenth Century* and *The Finer Tone: Keats' Major Poems*.

ORDER FROM YOUR

BOOKSTORE OR . . .

*The Johns Hopkins Press*

BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND